

6018 Oct. 19, 1933

# JOURNAL

OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS

NABI

VOLUME I

1933

PART I

## The Word of God\*

CHESTER WARREN QUIMBY, *Professor in Dickinson College*

*"Not that I have already attained."*

THAT all is not well with the teaching of English Bible is a well-known and all too bitter axiom. The early hope that we might become an influential national society has failed. The southern section—the very core of the "Bible Belt"—was still born. The central and western sections have become vague societies of religion. The Bible departments of our own section are fast changing to departments of religion, so that now although we only are left they are seeking our life to take it away. Any survey will show that college Bible is pretty much flat on its back.

For this situation we are not entirely responsible. It is no fault of ours that Sunday School teaching sends youth to college scorning any thought of Bible study. We are hardly to blame that many preachers are openly hostile to us and most of the rest quite indifferent. We cannot help it that even the best of the church-going parents have so thoroughly neglected the Bible that their children consider it of no account. It is not chargeable to us that college executives and faculties generally do not see that Bible has any vital place in modern education. Ours is not the blame that Bible is not needed in making a living. One may need chemistry or English or pedagogy, but not Bible. And most of all, it certainly is not directly to be debited against us that Religious Education, which at first ignored the Bible, that not being its major field, is now becoming hostile to collegiate biblical instruction. Though we have in recent years added philosophy, psychology and the history of religion to our college courses, as well as re-

ligious education, the fact remains that as long as we are Christians, the Bible underlies everything. It is the basic literary and historical material Christians possess.

For these difficulties we are very little responsible. But there are other and severe indictments to which we must plead guilty. We have done little to bridge the chasm between ourselves, the Sunday schools and clergy. The church reared and educated us and in the walls of her institutions most of us serve. Yet from many of us she gets little back but criticism. Again, some of Religious Education's hostile attitude toward us is but a just reward for our ignoring it. To many of its "findings" we have returned an amused smile, having known for years what it has so "newly" discovered. As to the rest we have just passed it by and gone on our own way, until we have been given up as hopelessly hidebound.

We have greatly weakened ourselves, also, by our too ready collusion with all other religious movements to stand bowing and scraping at the door of science, asking for a certificate of intellectual decency. This we have paraded before men, to be seen of them. Then when science has shifted, back we have gone, hat in hand, begging a new bill of health. Our purpose has been honest. We have wanted to appear intellectually respectable in the modern world. We have wanted outsiders to see us as sane and sensible. But too often we have made it appear that Bible and religion were subject to the censorship of the ever shifting sciences. We have forgotten that religion stands in its own right. It is not the underling of any learning. The most helpless of all religions is that which is reduced to

\*President's address at the Annual Meeting.

the level called "every day practical common-sense." The gospel is not a little common-sense affair that is to be joined in married harmony with an ever changing science. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation! And that is something very different.

The thing of which we are most guilty is our utterly impossible pedagogy. We have made nearly everything out of the Bible, history, literature, archaeology, sociology, criticism—anything except the Word of God! How we do teach lay adolescents!—youngsters who will never be professionally religious and who all their lives will be busy about many things. Nor will they ever be scholars. Not one in a hundred will ever espouse a thoroughly scholastic career. Indeed, society could not use them should they wish to become scholars. Yet we teach them as if they were scholars in the making. We carefully organize and elaborately systemize everything—scholars' knowledge for eventual scholars. Some of our courses require the freshmen children to make a scrap-book for synoptic harmony. We have courses galore on the historical development of the Hebrews, all corrected and reordered according to the latest criticism and archaeological research. Yet the scientific fact is that the Hebrew Bible has no historical books in it. They are books of the Law and Prophecy. Others of us teach our lay adolescents the development of Hebrew religion step by step from polytheism to ethical monotheism. But these young students never saw an idol and will never see an animal sacrifice. Idolism will never challenge their lives. It is materialism and secularism that will politely ruin them. Still other courses require these beginners to take crayons and make a polychrome Bible with J, E, D, P all properly colored. How many courses there are that treat the Bible as orations, fables, biographies, letters, tracts and dreams! Then how we do love to lecture! We turn ourselves into vocalized textbooks, punctuated by collateral and quizzes, where the helpless students year after year take down our already written words. One is reminded of an ancient way of multiplying manuscripts.

Then what a stumbling block miracles are! With science on one side and psychology on the other, it is like balancing on a tight rope. Some of us just get rid of them altogether. Elijah calling down fire from heaven and Jesus' feeding the five thousands are legends.

Others of us steer a middle course. We have ready "explanations" that "harmonize" with psychology and medicine. Uzzah, putting forth his hand to steady the ark, died of superstitious fright or heart-failure. The five thousand were stimulated by Jesus' example to share their personal lunches. Our object has been to bring the biblical stories into harmony with modern knowledge. As if modern knowledge were ever the final word. It is so easy to forget that a religion which cannot, *within its own realm*, deal with pain, weakness and disease, and bring to them aid from beyond the bounds of either psychology or medicine is a crippled religion. If religion has no resources beyond the reach of those who ignore its power with which to deal with the physical calamities of life it lacks vital meaning for one of life's greatest woes. Yet how few of our students ever suspect that God both cares and directly aids in physical agonies. Ought we not to get beyond that kind of scientific adolescence where we think it either necessary or possible to "explain" ancient orientalisms in the exact terms of modern scientific knowledge?

But perhaps the most universal of all our pedagogical shortcomings are our survey courses, where we cover everything from the prehistoric chaos to the judgment day. We offer surveys of the Old Testament, surveys of the New, surveys of biblical history and surveys of biblical religion, surveys of its literature, surveys of its transmission, and even surveys where we begin with the creation and J, E, D, P, plow right on through the Bible, and then after adding the origin of the Canon trace the biblical development from the Septuagint to Moffat and Goodspeed! Too often, the student getting a smattering of everything acquires a real knowledge of nothing. If we will but recall our own student days, we will remember that those teachers from whom we derived the most benefit were not those who with meticulous accuracy neither omitted nor misplaced any fact and who demanded of us all the knowledge the traffic would bear. Rather they were those who, while holding to rigid standards, reduced their courses to a bare minimum of essential knowledge and then with elaborate and colorful illustrations embroidered it into the very texture of our minds. Ought we not to follow their wise example?

Last year we listened enrapt to a beautiful

and earnest paper on teaching the Life of Christ. Most of us, and certainly myself, took notes and profited therefrom. But as the paper went on some of us began to have a sinking feeling. This life of Christ was a course for the junior year. Not until the student had a thorough background in the Old Testament, an adequate information of the New Testament times, a good knowledge of the synoptic problem could he begin the life of Jesus proper. Then and then only was he ready to appreciate the Master's story. This for lay adolescents! If this be true, how will most of our college students ever come to see Jesus? And what hope is there for the huge mass of non-college young people? If this is all really necessary, we are of all people most miserable. One wonders how Francis, Bunyan and Moody ever did it!

The last great stumbling block to our true success is our listless living. To be sure ours is no easy situation. Ignored by students, passed up by the clergy, tolerated by the faculty, ours is often a lonely and discouraging task. Yet how easily we sit down with the contented, comfortable middle class! We teach the prophets but are not prophetic. We describe prayer but too little practice it. We offer courses in the Bible and then assign long collateral lists about it. We teach the evangel, yet never evangelize. We expound the sacrifice of Jesus yet the smell of fire is not on our clothes. How little we differ from our associates of lesser religious pretensions! One wonders what Amos or Paul, to say nothing of Jesus, would think of us. The fault lies not in our stars but in ourselves that we are underlings. Unless our campus living radiates the joyous, hard sacrifice of Jesus, our classroom teaching will die on our lips.

Sometimes when I sit among biblical scholars, listening to some intricate technical paper, or when I have left my own classroom after having achieved some very clever solution to a biblical difficulty, I have seen the form of one like unto the Son of Man standing and saying, "One of you shall betray me!" For "it cannot be that our Christian faith depends for its truth and its power upon matters of past fact which are always open to new and critical investigation. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that religion itself can depend on results of studies which are not the least religious in their nature. For it is quite evident that neither literary criticism nor the study of the

background of Christian beginnings . . . has in itself any religious character . . . These questions may be studied, and interesting and important results attained by learned research, and yet Jesus Himself be left strangely out of sight . . . It does not require an historian's training to recognize and respond to the personal presence of Jesus in the gospels. A simple and genuinely human soul may see it and rejoice in it, and a very good historian may miss it altogether . . . It depends more upon what one *is* than what one *knows*.\* It may be said with equal truth that critical studies which are not backed by a profound religious sympathy will as often miss the truth as find it. It is possible to so misconceive Jesus as to read out of the gospels what may be the very heart of the truth concerning him. It is equally evident that teaching the results of modern scholarship is not in itself of any religious value. Nor is such teaching, though done in the name of religion, in itself a religious task. To be sure, the results of modern, critical learning do give a background for truer religious appreciation, yet such knowledge of itself does not engender faith, and if not taught with religious enthusiasm and insight it may hinder religious values. Our very study and teaching of the Word of God may be an unconscious but terrible fulfillment of the Masters' words, "One of you shall betray me."

Now what is the cure? What can be done about it? If by "cure" is meant, what can fill our class-rooms, what can make us popular, the answer is nothing. Under present conditions we can never be popular. We shall never be embarrassed by any mass-movement in our direction. But if by "cure" is meant, what can we do to become as effective as possible, how can we seriously challenge our times, then the answer is, not in an easy way. No mere revising of text-books will do it. No gentle re-vamping of our courses will be effective. The way is deep and hard. Chief of all, we must be different. What the Bible declares we must experience. The thirteenth of First Corinthians, the eighth of Romans and the Sermon on the Mount must become a natural part of us. Paul's "Fruits of the Spirit" must be true descriptions of our actual characters. We must be the Word of God if we are to teach the Word of God.

\*F. C. Porter: *The Mind of Christ in Paul*, pages 7, 162, 8. Scribners.

We must teach the Bible as the Word of God. Like Jesus, we must teach to transform life. He was a teacher, not of history or literature or critical findings, but of divine experience. Nothing less is our task. We are teaching adolescent laymen, youths who will never be scholars. Ours is the best and in most cases the only substantial religious teaching they will ever have. Only religious values last. "Findings" change. The "assured results of scholarship" are continually being modified. All questions of history, documents, scientific and even psychological problems must be kept in a subordinate place. For adolescent laymen many of them should be ignored altogether. Philip—he who expounded the Scripture to the Ethiopian—should be our patron saint. Our students do not come to us saying: How can I be critically correct about the Scripture? They come saying nothing. But in their hearts there beats and burns the Rich Young Ruler's panting question: What can I do to get the most satisfying thrill from life? Begin where you will, raise what problems you must, the true end is always Jesus and the Good Life.

For the Bible is Religion. It is the Word of God. It is as the Word of God that we must teach it, full of wonder, power and regenerating energy. It is so easy to "explain" the Ten Plagues in a wholly natural and probably somewhat true fashion. Then we proceed to get the Israelites across the Sea of Reeds quite easily by the aid of wind and tide. Our students leave the class-room quite clear and content in their minds. Things have been "explained" and they "understand." But they have not heard the thundering Word of God, "The cry of the children of Israel is come unto me, *I* have seen the affliction of my people, *I* know their sorrows and *I* am come down to deliver them. Let my people go!" There are, I think, nowhere in literature words so significant for our present economic calamity. Sometimes I think that vastly better than all our findings is the insight of the ignorant negro slaves, as expressed in their great soul spiritual, "Go down Moses, let My people go!" They swallowed the miraculous legends whole but they knew the truth of the Word of God. God hates industrial oppression. Any nation that persistently crushes its industrial classes will suffer an appalling ruin. History as well as the Bible declares it. We have seen it in our day and

with our own eyes. We ourselves are now beginning to suffer the plagues of Egypt. And how few students or teachers realize it.

None of us will swallow the Deuteronomists's philosophy of history whole. We are at pains to point out how he picked and twisted his material to suit his ends. We know how Job and Jesus denied his theory. But we miss the Word of God! Job and Jesus are talking of individuals. The Deuteronomist is speaking nationally. Yet all the while we set forth his short-comings, we are saying that for our times if we did economic justice and practiced economic mercy, prosperity would come again. Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people. None of us doubts it. And what is this but the Deuteronomist? May it not be that the D documents are not a mere ancient view of history, but a true Word of God, true for our times and all times?

Or take those four great miracles Mark gathered together to illustrate the mighty power of Jesus—the stilling of the storm, the casting out of demons from the Gerasene demoniac, the woman healed of her hemorrhage, and the raising of Jairus' daughter. They do not disturb us much. Jesus' quiet presence calmed the disciples' fears, the demoniac had only an hallucination anyway, the woman's new psychological attitude could not help but do wonders for her, and Jesus himself said the little girl was only sleeping. It is all so sane, sensible and scientific. Perhaps there is some real truth in these contentions, yet taken alone, how they miss the real truth the stories are eager to proclaim.

What gave these stories currency and power about 70 A. D.? Was it that people then being unscientific, could readily believe anything? Hardly. These stories were accepted because when told in meeting they were the Word of God. Christians could rise and declare, "I know it's true for Christ has done that for me!" They can all be illustrated from the life of Paul. See him in the storm, the Master at his side, unafraid, the real captain of the ship. Hear him sing, though he always believed in demons, "For I am convinced that neither angels nor their hierarchies nor any supernatural forces either or height or depth will be able to separate us from the love God has shown in Christ Jesus our Lord!" Listen to Him who suffered as few men have ever suffered from physical torments, "In

weakness made strong. I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me, 'My grace is sufficient for thee!' " Give heed as he cries, "O Grave where is thy victory? Oh death where is thy sting? Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord." Here, then, in Mark, is more than some debatable stories about Jesus. Here is the Word of God declaring what Christ means in human experience. It is possible for one "in Christ" to live without ever a fear, freed from the terrors of nature, liberated from the "fixations" and "complexes" of the mind, loosed from forebodings of illness and disease, and unhaunted by the ghost of death. These are the fears that everywhere dog the minds of even Christians. How our timid, cautious, fear-bound students need this liberating Word of God!

But why go on? The Bible is the Word of God. To teach it as anything less is to teach unscientifically. We are prone to think that scientific teaching requires that we line up the Bible with modern knowledge. So we teach the prophetic books from Joshua through Kings as history when they are really a sort of sermon series illustrated by historical incidents. Too often we teach the history and ignore the sermon. Can such pedagogy be really scientific which soft-pedals the avowed purpose of the authors to declare the Word of God? Is it scientific to analyze and explain the gospels if it does not leave the sincere student crying, "My Lord and my God"?

Let no one think that if he shifts the emphasis of his courses over to the teaching of the Bible emphatically as the Word of God that he is in for an easy task. Let him not think that it means a kind of Sunday School soothing syrup. Neither is he to suppose that his task is to deliver little class-room homilies. Even theologues will not abide a preaching teacher!

The professor who teaches Bible as the Word of God is in for a discouraging time. He wants to emphasize religion, but critical and historical questions insistently bob up. No matter how hard he tries to keep them in a justly subordinate place they will constantly forge to the front. Often he will finish the recitation with a blush of shame. He has spent so much time clearing up the problems he had had little left for the truth. Nor is it to be supposed that the average student is any more eager for religious knowledge than he

is for Latin or mathematics. Usually he is even less so as religious knowledge appears to be of little practical value and is relatively much harder to comprehend. It is far easier to grasp the significance of Sennacherib's comments on his invasion of Judah, or see the relation of Q to Matthew and Luke, than it is to perceive why one should love his enemies and do them good. Religious Education is telling us we ought to give ourselves to teaching character values. That would solve all our troubles. But as a matter of fact the average student would rather solve the puzzle of J, E, D, P than face the hard implications of the Ten Commandments. Even if religious truth is partially grasped it often seems to the student too high to be attained. Very few set out to climb the heavenly steeps 'mid peril, toil and pain.

Moreover the professor will find his own preparation vastly more difficult. Like his students he will find that critical problems can be gleaned from books or patiently worked out by quiet study. But religious truth requires insight, prolonged meditation and heroic living. Many a passage will appear barren of anything vital until after long brooding. Only then will it flash alive with the power of God. This kind of biblical knowledge cometh only by prayer and fasting.

Likewise when he has pierced the letter and mastered the truth the teacher will often be dismayed as he faces his class. His teaching of the Word of God will have an empty, hollow ring. He will come to the painful realization that the truth he is so eagerly expounding is far above his actual living. He has had the joy of glimpsing it but he has not yet assimilated it. So he speaks as clanging brass and sounding cymbal. He will leave the class whispering, "God be merciful unto me, a sinner!"

But there is no other way. A hard way it is, yet what a glorious way! The difficulties are staggering and the defeats discouraging, yet what challenges they are! They call out all there is in one, they compel one to search within the deeps of his own soul, and they send one continually to the Throne of Grace seeking needed reinforcement. Is any other task more inspiring or any other work more enthralling? *We have been allowed of God to be put in trust with the Scriptures!* Ours is the joy of interpreting the Good News. Ours the exalted privilege of setting forth the Word of

God. Freed from the rush of the busy world, ours is the high calling to teach religion *first*, and the Bible as the Word of God *first*, to the teacher who with scholarship and consecration, learning and Christ-like living, teaches the Word of God as the Word of God there will

come, not the easy outward success of full classes and jolly campus popularity, but an increasingly divine influence, a conviction within himself and a realization on the part of others that the Word of our God shall stand forever!

## A School Principal's Reaction to the Problem of Biblical Instruction

MIRA B. WILSON, *Principal of Northfield Seminary\**

WHEN I talk about Biblical instruction, I still find myself fully as much an ex-teacher of college Bible as a school head. And as I may be the only one in the room who has had just the experience which has been mine of teaching introductory courses in College Bible for eight years and then absenting myself from direct contact with the class room for three years (and this was an amicable agreement to separate, not in any sense a divorce), there are some things in retrospect and in perspective in my mind that I should like to speak of.

These introductory courses in either early college or late secondary school years are difficult, I think. The people who have the enviable job of teaching elective courses in some favorite section of the Bible such as Hebrews or the prophets or the fourth gospel scarcely realize how difficult. One of our present students said something applicable to the situation on my first meeting with her. She is totally blind and, by means of native intelligence, books in Braille, an unusual memory, a typewriter, and a sister who reads to her, getting ready for college and keeping herself on our school honor roll. We were talking about what books she would need and could get in Braille and I said thoughtlessly, "Of course the Bible you can secure in advance." She said, "Do you mind telling me what book of the Bible we will read first next September for, of course, if we used the whole Bible I would need a wheelbarrow." Even so with these introductory courses—they need a wheelbarrow.

Yet for many girls whom I have taught that introductory course was all they ever had or would have: the Bible had to stand or fall by it. As I look back I think there were some books I taught fairly well, others that suffered at my hands because they did not stir me suf-

ficiently, others that were inherently hard to teach to girls of the degree of maturity I have in mind, i. e., high school seniors and young college students. I take the liberty of mentioning these because if I were ever teaching introductory Bible again I should either have to do as H. G. Wells does, list what he personally considers the important books and keep to these (my list to be sure not being the same as his) or definitely stand off in perspective on my own teaching and "go after" the authors vigorously which I had been slighting.

I think I taught Jonah well. Why? First because it seemed one of the most significant books of the Old Testament to me. Second, because it has been so ill-treated and it is fun to clear the debris of ages that has accumulated about its base and give it a chance to breathe—a place in the sun. Third, because there was always that excellent, if informal, essay about it by W. P. Stoddard in the 1924 files of the *Atlantic*—to which one could refer the callous and hard of heart.

I think Jeremiah and Ezekiel, of the prophets, fared well at my hands. The dramatic circumstances of their lives and the self-revealing quality of their writing, especially of Jeremiah's, makes them a natural interest of the adolescent girl with whom I was dealing. She admires the rangy, impulsive Jeremiah as she does the long-haired Celtic poet—the real poet—who occasionally strays to the campus and is listened to with bated breath. One of my college sophomores produced a one-act play developing the scene where Ezekiel receives the message of the fall of Jerusalem. As I recall how the class produced it on a tree bordered stretch of campus lawn, I feel sure that Ezekiel fired the imaginations of that particular group.

I think we learned much in our initial survey of Job—as much as "we" were old enough

\*Read at the Annual Meeting.

to understand. If Professor Toy's Encyclopedia Britannica article had first made Job mean something to the teacher, let me give credit where credit is due and admit that it was often H. G. Wells' "Undying Fire," his Job Huss, that made it real to the girls. Undoubtedly his is an entirely transitory book as contrasted with the enduring qualities of the original, but calculated to make skilful connections for the hopelessly modern mind.

I suppose we revelled in Ecclesiastes because it was such virgin soil—no Sunday School teacher had had a chance at it first.

I think Paul's letters were reasonably well taught, partly because we could have the friendly contribution of both Christian and Jewish girls in the class and partly because his slant on life was and is so stimulating to the teacher.

But now for the weak points. As I think of J, E, D, and P and those sources done in vari-colored crayon with varying degrees of scholarly accuracy in their Bibles, I can only make the very unorthodox remark, "What of it!" Yes, to show the development of ethical and religious conceptions I admit their chronology may with careful study mean much to us. But in an introductory course, I fear that I should make short work of them now.

I failed on First Isaiah and as I know I worked harder over him than almost any other prophet, I often wonder why. My answer for young students now is that waiving aside for the moment the fragmentary character of the material the same difficulty inheres in teaching girls Isaiah as in stirring them to an enthusiastic appreciation of George Washington. We have all been more or less involved in that latter procedure this year. There was in both men a maturity, a poise and control, an objective quality of mind whose value and importance and charm is not easily apparent to them. And in the case of Isaiah there is no Mount Vernon.

What shall I say of Hosea and Amos! Frankly of Hosea I must report that the girls always looked at me with wide open eyes as much as to say, "You say these first three chapters mean this and we are accustomed to taking your word on it. But how do you know?" The text of Hosea is a stumbling block even in his great eleventh chapter. There are question marks in my mind about Amos, too. I do believe he was in every way a landmark in ethical thinking. I would not

have our students miss his "justice that rolls down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream." But he is strong meat for seventeen and eighteen-year-old girls. I know that we are accustomed to call the younger generation sophisticated. So they have been superficially. But few of them, from sheltered American homes, can understand Amos' moral bitterness. It seems overdrawn to them. Unless the depression may perhaps have interpreted it to them. Have you ever tried to read Amos' remarks about the women of his time (or Isaiah's either) to a chapel audience of modern girls? I heard one woman do the latter once in the Smith College chapel and thanked my lucky stars that I was not in her shoes.

My teaching of introductory Bible does not make me happy in retrospect on the Psalms and the gospels. Why? Is life, as Father Tyrrell claims, the only schoolmaster to lead us to Christ or can the direction be well taken in Bible II? I know that the real trouble with this particular teacher in these two sections as with Deutero-Isaiah was her respect for the poetry of the books and the concise simplicity of the gospels, her fear of marring something already perfect.

So much for the admissions of an ex-teacher about teaching material! May I go on to say one or two things about emphases I should try to make if I had it all to do over again.

I should be sure that somewhere along the line, even although I had not covered all the arguments for and against the Davidic origin of the Psalms, I had stressed the basic character of the psalmist's conception of nature. Not as she is pictured in Williams James' "Is Life Worth Living?", the nature that is red in tooth and claw, but the nature "that is no harlot but an alma mater." And I should have steeped myself more than I have but not more than I would like to in the books of moderns like J. Arthur Thomson who as scientists appreciate the nature psalmist and feel his kinship with their thought of a modern world of law. That is something for a boy or girl to live by.

I hope I should stress the Bible as a great storehouse of information about ethics. How the narrative sections come into their own on that score! How the adolescent, groping out toward understanding of his or her own human relationships, appreciates the discussion a skilful teacher can direct of motivation as in Elijah's depressed retreat into the wilder-

ness or Elisha's transactions with the pompous sick king and his own devious servant Gehazi. However ancient and uncertain the oral tradition of these stories and their relation to the rest of the Book of Kings their truth to human nature now as then remains. Take some modern volume like Hornell Hart's "Science of Human Relations" and read it in the light of the illustrative material with which you are familiar in the Bible and you will agree I think on the stress the psychology and ethics of the Bible deserve. Do read Professor Conklin in "The Direction of Human Evolution" on the egocentric and ethnocentric aspects of the religion of the future. The major prophets are summoned to the witness stand at once—even Amos and Hosea with all their difficulties.

I wonder if we give the intensely live persons in our classrooms a chance to realize the light the Bible throws on the truth of human intercourse. And the light it throws on the truth of man's relation to the divine, and how in both these fields thoughtful men in the period covered by the composition of the Bible "came on"! In the year when I was teaching, the chronological study of the books of the Bible was considered so important that often there was little time left for the development of a phase of religious or ethical thought. That would have savored too much of systematic theology.

What about biblical history?—If I were doing this introductory course again, I should soft pedal some of it. The younger child has a natural curiosity about the sequence of events and likes very much to know "what happened next" to the divided kingdoms. Some of that should be gotten earlier. Compared with some peoples whom I could mention, the history of the Hebrews is not important as a record of political, economic, or military practice. To be sure present day excavation lights it up and is a mine of material for the teacher of biblical history. But I would venture to believe that only as the history in turn illuminates the art of this people is it important. Dare I label it a tool subject? Dare I suggest that some of us have overstressed it for the purposes of introductory courses? As test I suggest the re-reading of examination papers in Old Testament set by you ten years ago. How many of the items there requested have any bearing on the character and life of those who answered them with patience

or with ignorance, as the case may have been a decade ago.

On the other hand I should stress the Bible as art. Think of the art which has had its inception in the Bible. Listen to a literary critic in the *Nation* on the Bible as the basis for the best American folk literature—a purely secular approach.\*

It is not only the poets. See what the biblical form of narration has done to Mrs. Buck's writing of "Good Earth." Hear its rhythm resound in the pages of Woodrow Wilson's essays. Watch its effect on the late C. E. Montague; I dare not hazard a guess as to the number of outright quotations or sentences reminiscent of biblical parallels he inserted into his "Hind Let Loose."

"Truth gives a book weight but beauty gives it immortality," some one has declared. In my father's study are the books he has been reading over a lifetime of four score years. Gradually to the shelves inaccessible because so near the ceiling have been relegated many of the books he had when in college, when he was a young teacher, when he was later in theological seminary. Presumably they represented truth, at least what was then the valid contemporary approach to truth. I can say beyond a shadow of a doubt that they had weight. As the lower shelves became crowded boxes filled from the upper shelves were sold to the second-hand book man. But the Bible has never been in the upper shelf category. When I was a child I heard father sing with apparently equal zest "Shall we gather at the river" and "Lord of all being throned afar, Thy glory streams from sun and star." One has dropped out of remembrance. The other resounds with stateliness and fervor still. Art gives endurance.

Because it has given the truths of the Bible endurance, I think we should make much of it. If I were going to teach the Bible again I should first hunt up the most successful teacher of English literature I could find. There are men and women in most institutions

\*"There is no denying that the Bible came over in the Mayflower, and went across the plains in covered wagons, with the plows and flint-lock rifles of those inescapable people, the pioneers. For three hundred years on this soil, and many more hundreds on another, our evangelically minded ancestors have likened the events of their every-day lives to those of Daniel, Moses and Isaac, Magdalen and Eve. Achilles has slain his thousands, but David his tens of thousands. Abraham—Ezekiel—Jeremiah—the very names of the old Hebrew prophets have acquired a peculiarly American flavor. Our new poetry, I think, will come from this material of our old religion, and our new religion speak in the accents of our old poetry. The Bible, not Paul Bunyan or the *Odyssey*, is the great American folk literature."

worthy the name of educational who are making Shakespeare, for instance, the loved and permanent spiritual possession of their students. Before undertaking to teach the gospels or psalms or Deutero-Isaiah again I should sit at the feet of some such good teachers. I should try to keep in mind the difference between the antiquarian and the art interest for youth. The former is rarely an acquired, never a native, interest for the young. I should treat reverently the greatest biblical passages lest by emphasizing the grammar or history I brush off the bloom of the freshness of spiritual experience permanently.

That somehow reading aloud on the part of both students and teachers would enter in to the pursuit of the Bible as literature, I am convinced. It seems to hold true that the hearing of the ear helps not only the student's comprehension of the truth and beauty of a passage but helps determine the initial appropriateness of the passage for study. To go back to my first inquiry into what should be included in our introductory courses, much reading of the Bible out loud in Chapel has persuaded me that the parts for teaching stress, if we care anything about the residuum for life, are those which will bear reading aloud. "Ho, Ariel, Ariel, the city where David encamped" is a great speech full of skilful rhetoric as well as puns, but you can't read it in Chapel, because you have to have footnotes. And of Zechariah's final remarks, "Yea many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek Jehovah of hosts in Jerusalem and to entreat the favor of Jehovah . . . In those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, they shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, 'We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you'" is full of religious and historical import, but it can't be read in chapel or around the fire because it is not sufficiently poetic prose. (Yet of the dic-

tion of much of the Bible John Livingston Lowes could say that "utter simplicity, limpid clearness, the vividness of direct authentic vision of unworded things and old" are its salient qualities.)

Where should such an introductory course as I have been commenting on, come. I am old-fashioned enough to think that required secondary school courses in Bible are sound. Not any one hour a week appointments but a generous allowance of time. The required element bothers me less than many in the business of curriculum building. I was borne out in this by the sweetly philosophic remarks of a seven-year-old girl whom I asked the other day what she wanted for Christmas. "What you want," she said, "is hard to know. Sometimes you don't know you want it till you get it." If it is so with Christmas presents and life in general—how true it can be of required courses. I have known many students in my day who didn't know they wanted biblical introduction until they got it.

If I were going to teach Bible II again, I should seize the chance to look over the pages of the actual Bibles used by a few of the best Christians I know whether lettered or unlettered. I am willing to wager that the dog-eared pages would be about the same in either case and I would take my hints as to teaching material from those. For I am convinced that our first business in teaching the Bible is to make it a loved book—to make it, if the publishers will cooperate on its physical aspects, a book to be carried with one in coat pockets and on camping trips, etc., as a treasure, to make it in no sanctimonious but in a very real sense "a means of grace." College and secondary school text books do ultimately get relegated to the top shelf. We hate to admit it but we may as well do so. Have we erred (I think I have) in trying too hard to make the Bible resemble a text book? It is one of the books that can never be reduced to those confines.

## The Future of the Bible in the American College\*

HUGH HARTSHORNE, *Professor in Yale University*

A RECENT study† of the status and trends of religious teaching in colleges and universities raises certain questions about the place of the Bible in the curriculum. Dur-

ing the seven years elapsing between 1923 and 1931, there was a falling off in the hours of credit earned in biblical courses in denominational colleges, both in comparison with increase in total enrollments and in absolute

\*Abstract of paper read at the Annual Meeting.

numbers. Along with this change, there was both a relative and an absolute increase in credits earned in non-biblical religious subjects. This change has accompanied an increase in the offerings in the non-biblical field—philosophy and psychology of religion, ethics, comparative religion, etc.—so that what has happened is that enrollments have tended to shift from biblical to non-biblical subjects as the latter became available. Nevertheless, the total enrollment in religious subjects has not increased nearly as fast as has the enrollment of the colleges.

This change in enrollment in biblical courses may be a good or bad thing for college youth. In any case it needs to be explained, particularly since similar trends appear in private colleges and in tax-supported institutions.

One cause may be in the type of preparation for such work given in Sunday Schools. In neither the traditional nor the modern school is the Bible dignified by the manner of its use. Either it is broken up into unrelated passages of supposedly inspirational value, or it is dealt with as a glorified proof text for the solution of all human ills. Fortunately neither method is common in college teaching. It may be, indeed, that in the departments teaching religion there has been too wide a divorce between biblical material and the more pressing religious problems of the students, for religion tends to be pocketed in courses and departments, and has so far failed to serve as the focus or integrating center of the life of the student, which many hold to be its natural function.

Another difficulty may be inadequate distinction between courses taught as a part of preparation for leadership and courses taught for their immediate worth to the students' own religious or cultural need. In either case, it is proper to raise the question of the place

<sup>†</sup>This study was conducted by Dr. Willard E. Uphaus and the author in connection with a larger investigation of the status and trends of religious education, carried on under the auspices of Institute of Social and Religious Research. This phase of the study will appear in a volume entitled *Standards and Trends in Religious Education*, by Hartshorne, Stearns, and Uphaus, Yale Press.

the Bible actually now has in the character growth of individuals. Practically, its place is ignored. Theological seminaries, for example, do not inquire into a candidate's knowledge of the Bible as an indication of his character before admitting him. Nor do examinations on knowledge of the Bible reveal any general relation between such knowledge and conduct and character. This is true both for students entering seminary and for children in the grades.

If the Bible is made central in either the religious teaching of college students or in the curriculum of seminaries, then the courses are out of focus—they are not centered, as now taught, on the actual needs and problems of students.

If we could rid ourselves of the superstition that mere Bible knowledge is an assured road to the good life, we would be free to deal with the Bible objectively, on historical and literary grounds, appealing to its attraction rather than to some independent power it may be supposed to possess over the lives of individuals. On these grounds, the college is the natural place to teach it, for it is an adult book about adult religion, to be taken with discrimination, mature judgment, and historical knowledge of the circumstances of its varied origins, not as a guide to detailed modes of conduct.

The transition to this view from early teaching is a difficult one for many to take without loss of faith. This is the opportunity of the college. Testimonies of students reveal, however, that it is an opportunity not as yet fully appreciated by college authorities. Whatever may be the value of biblical religion for today, this value is not generally recognized by students, who, on the whole, shun the biblical courses. There is no news in this—only a recognition of the need for a better understanding of the needs of students and a challenge to the colleges to recognize in some practical way the central place of religion in contemporary civilization.

## The Bible and Modern Education

JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN, *Lecturer in Biblical History, Wellesley College*

**T**HREE are two interests which are central to the theory and practice of modern education. The first concerns the making of useful and effective members of society;

the second, the fullest development of personality, the realization of a rich selfhood. Usually, these two interests are combined into one, the building of character.

The building of character is a piecemeal and gradual operation. Life presents a child with many problems which demand solution. Therefore it is necessary that he should acquire certain skills, that he should learn to direct his attention to particular social and technological problems, that he should become an efficient manipulator of instruments, whether a bit of machinery or his mind. Thus education is learning the use of instruments to particular and practical ends.

Life is experimental. New problems require new solutions. Old solutions, general principles and formulas have cogency to a new situation only in so far as the new partakes of the nature of the old. In fact, old principles are or may be impediments in the way of satisfactory treatment of new situations. Hence there are no ultimate objectives, no eternal laws of conduct. Morals, which are patterns of social action, are relative to and change with social processes. And as the year 1932 A. D. presents us with a spectacle of life very different from that of 500 B. C., in our approach to life we must turn our eyes to the present rather than to the past, to the analysis of present facts rather than to the wisdom of the ages or some supposed eternal truth.

As social situations differ from each other, so children also differ from each other. Many men, many natures. A particular child must meet life in his own particular way. He must be allowed maximum freedom to flower into a personality natural to his own constitution. Therefore neither religious ideas nor rules of conduct may be infiltrated into the mind of the child. These he must discover or create experimentally, according to his nature, within a particular social milieu.

Now, let us consider the Bible in view of some such theory of education. It is at once apparent that it cannot be treated as a repository of truths instrumental to the control of our physical environment. It is admitted by all except the most benighted that the Bible is not a scientific textbook. Let us turn then to the question of the moral value of the Bible. Many people believe that the Bible is concerned with "spiritual values," with the principles and ideals which are essential to harmonious social living. Hence it is claimed that the Bible continues to be a book priceless for promoting goodness. It appears that although biblical ideas concerning God and

man, creation and redemption, prophecy and authority, may be incorrect, the Bible remains our guide to the discovery of the good life; not the whole Bible, but those parts which are readily recognized as excellent. Hence it is claimed that the Bible fulfills the requirements of modern education in that it contains many moral ideas and much moral dynamic, in that it can or does contribute to public welfare.

But alas, as a textbook of ethics, the Bible is a confusing document. Who has taught the O. T. without often being tempted to apologize for the doings of a given patriarch, or judge, or king, or even prophet? Is it not the truth that, if our aim is to supply the students with moral truth, precepts for the regulation of conduct in our present society, much of the O. T. appears as irrelevant and even harmful? Would not one do better by turning to Dhammapada, or the Analects of Confucius, or the letters of Chesterton to his son, or for that matter, Franklin's Poor Richard? When we put the Bible in the treasury of the world's moral wisdom, can we claim convincingly that it occupies a unique position, or even a position which would justify a year's course in the overcrowded curriculum of a college? Does not the oft-lauded historical approach to the Bible put the moral insights contained in it in their proper social setting and raise questions concerning their relevancy to modern life? Even where we are concerned with such general matters as love, patience, humility, unselfishness, do we not encounter the greatest difficulty in making these appear as anything but platitudes, and do we not find it extremely hard to discover their proper application to modern life? There may well be wisdom in accepting the judgment of the modern man concerning the social value of the Bible for this age.

Now let us look at the Bible as a religious document. Perhaps not many of us believe that one can make a fast and easy distinction between biblical religion and biblical morality. We think of ourselves as teachers of religion and not as teachers of mere morality. What then shall we say of the biblical ideas of God, and man, and sin, and salvation? What shall we make of the all-too-human ideas of God in the Bible, of the pictures of man, sinning and ungrateful man, as given us by the Hebrew historians, of the conception of sin as guilt before the most holy God, of salvation as dependent upon the mercy of this same God?

What shall we make of the jealous God, the deity who is above obligation, sovereign and free? What shall we think of the Hebrew's preoccupation with God and his naive insistence that all things, good and evil, come from the righteous God?

We often speak of teaching the religion of Jesus as though here were something which anybody would appreciate and accept. Well then, do we find Jesus' conception of God, intrinsically Hebrew and prophetic, easy to present? Jesus' conception of His intimate and personal relationship with God, his belief that He was doing God's work and preparing men for the Kingdom, a Kingdom of God, to be ushered in by God—do we find the ears of our students tingling when they hear the good news? Is not the modern mind puzzled by Jesus' conception of the Providence of God and his watchfulness over even the least of His children? Is it not a sign of our failure to make even the religion of Jesus real that we should end discussion with an invitation that people accept it as a matter of faith because of its salutary effects upon their lives?

If then we teach biblical religion, we teach a religion which is foreign to the modern mind. The modern religious educator is interested in the building of character, in guiding his pupils to a rich, wholesome, healthy, happy life, in cultivating truthfulness, honesty, generosity, etc., which concern primarily present and practical social situations. Therefore he is wise in minimizing biblical study. The writers of the Bible were not interested in the development of personality. Their minds worked in quite another way. They sought to know the will of God concerning man. They regarded life as girded and undergirded by God. They recognized God as the Providence who governed the course of life, as the Creator and merciful Father, as the ruler of heaven and earth who demanded obedience. All things were *sub specie Dei*. God was the beginning and the end of all things. Whether they prospered, it was of God. Whether they suffered, it was of God. In their righteousness they obeyed God. In their unrighteousness, they disobeyed God, they sinned. For their salvation from sin and suffering and their enemies, they depended on God. They taught dependence on God, and not self-dependence, salvation and not self-realization, obedience and not self-culture. They thought of themselves as recipients, unworthy objects of divine care,

ungrateful benefitters from divine benevolence. They had faith in God and not in themselves, they valued the honor of God and not their own happiness, they listened to the word of God and not to their own reason.

Perhaps these are not real antinomies. Real self-dependence is the fruit of dependence on God. Nevertheless, there is a disparity between the biblical mind and our mind which may not be overlooked. It seems that there is a biblical temper, a biblical perspective, which is other than our own. It seems that the modern mind has realised this and turned away from the Bible. There is no dearth of interest in religion nowadays. The avidity with which men discuss humanism, naturalism, science and religion, the eagerness with which they turn to scientists for support of faith, are sufficient evidence that they are concerned with religion. But it is also evident that they do not expect help from the Bible. Their religious questions are not argued and answered to their satisfaction in the Bible. In it they find no arguments for the existence of God, nor do they discover a support for their values. Their interest in freedom and survival seem to be irrelevant to the biblical perspective and set aside because of the all-absorbing preoccupation of the Bible with divine will and government. Therefore, it is not surprising that neither the modern religious educator nor the modern religious philosopher can find much use for the Bible. The significance of the Bible has become questionable even for the teaching of religion.

Now it seems that assuming the mind of modern education, the Bible does not deserve a prominent place in a college curriculum. Whatever we may think of the matter, this is the judgment of our authorities and we shall not be able to prove them wrong. I know of only one way which will give the Bible a place of dignity in modern education—and that is the use of the Bible as a protest against the assumptions and aims of our educators. So long as these are left unchallenged, the Bible must continue to suffer neglect.

I question the wisdom of the theory and practice of modern education. In the first place, what is self-realization? what empirical justification is there for thinking of education as a process of the exfoliation of a self? The self grows in an environment, and the latter has everything to do with how it grows. Pedagogically, the idea of education as self-expres-

sion and self-realization is well-nigh worthless. It is erroneous to talk of self-dependence while we are subjected continuously to influences which shape our lives. Were the Hebrews really less justified in their theocentric outlook than we are in our self-centeredness? This cult of self, together with the subjectivism and psychologism it involves, is based upon a metaphysic which differs from that of the Hebrews in probably being false.

Secondly, modern education, because of its exclusive interest in practice and in centering attention to limited issues, has developed skills but not great souls. In minimising history, it has diverted attention from the more perennial issues of life, from the profounder needs of men which are relatively constant, from great lives and thoughts which shine through time and lift men above the superficialities of the particular. We are paying dearly for this. The modern man is appallingly lacking in perspective and wisdom, the two essentials of character. The stuff from which the benefactors of mankind are made is not the kind of thing one achieves in seeking social adjustment. The practical-mindedness of the modern man has made him a slave of his environment; it has obscured his vision, impoverished his mind and soul.

Character and happiness are by-products. They are available to those who learn to lose themselves in ends which transcend their selves, and not to those who seek to build their character or apply their minds to the pursuit of happiness. When the self becomes the center of attention, even in pursuit of heaven, it shrivels and dies. There is more wisdom in Jesus' words, "Seek first the Kingdom of God," than in all our concern with self-love and our right to it. There is more good sense in that the chief end of man is to serve God and enjoy Him forever than in that we should develop our highest personalities. Man grows by turning to the Beyond as the flower to the sun. That is why the Bible is wise in its God-centeredness and we are foolish in our man-centeredness.

Thirdly, the lack of historical perspective, for all our pride in our scientific method and our realism, has filled the modern mind with half-truths which, alas, have great practical significance. Our estimate of human powers has become romantic and unrealistic in the extreme. That perennial backsliding which appears ever again, under every kind of guise,

in our individual, social, racial, international relationships, which has attracted the attention of the Hebrew prophets, of Buddha, Hobbes, Hume, Kant, I dare say of all men of insight —what magic wand is it that has enabled us to do away with it? May it not be true that we have become blind? What sudden scientific insight is it that has disproved the dictum of Jesus Christ, "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it"? Are we not unwise to accept the enlightened utilitarianism of the age in believing that the exercise of self-love and the pursuit of happiness will somehow lead us to the millennium? There is something trivial and futile about the idea that by a certain application to our immediate problems we will come to happy issue, without that dependence on God, that repentance and regeneration which men have for ages considered essential for salvation. It is absurd to think that without feeding our souls with the bread of life we shall produce fruits worthy of the spirit; that without nourishing our souls with the insights of the centuries, without that grace which God bestows upon the pure in heart, we shall achieve peace and excellence. Insofar as the modern mind ignores these truths, which are stated and exemplified so eminently in the Scriptures, it is engaged in vanity.

Finally, modern education is essentially naturalistic. It has humanized and psychologised all to reduce it to the pattern of the modern mind. It has explained away the dualism of the Hebrew mind, it has identified God with nature, it has eliminated all supernatural element from its thought, it has come to ignore the problem of eternity and destiny, by making thought on such matters illegitimate and identifying them with archaic philosophies and cosmologies. It has closed its eyes to the transitoriness of life and the tragedy of death. It has sought to smother the cry of the human heart for the real and the eternal, by flooding the mind with satisfactions and partial delights. It has rejected as psychologically bad man's sense of loneliness and futility. It has ridiculed the humiliation of sin and glorified the flesh. It has therefore produced a mentality zealous for worldly success, anxious to acquire and keep, adventurous, grabbing, full of a sense of its own importance, conscious of its duty to itself. Such is the moral pattern which the naturalist en-

gaged in education has either produced or else tolerated.

When we contrast this naturalism of the modern mind with the supernaturalism of the Bible, we become conscious both of our difficulty and our opportunity. We can now see that we have a message for the modern man, a message which is universally neglected.—God is! We read the Torah, and learn that God commands. We read the history of the Hebrew nation, and learn that the righteous God overrules all things. We read the prophets and learn that God speaks and demands, that He judges and disposes. We read the N. T. and learn that "God so loved the world that He sent His only begotten Son." This is the answer of the Bible to our naturalism.

Again we open the Bible and consider its heroes, Moses, Amos, Jeremiah, Jesus, Paul! Rebels, socially ill-adjusted people, makers of trouble, a suffering lot, men who protested against the morality, nay, even against the piety of their day. They were reviled and persecuted, and one of them died on the Cross. This is the answer of the Bible to our search for social adjustment. Success, prosperity, peace, comfort. There is no book in the world as diametrically opposite to the modern mind as the Bible.

The Bible is the negation of everything characteristic of the modern mind. When we teach it, we hurt the pride of the modern man, we question his self-sufficiency, his reason, his virtue, nay, his religion. We often fail to perceive this because we also have become humanized and naturalized. We often do not believe in the Bible sufficiently to teach it as we find it. We must needs show wherein it is acceptable and useful to the modern mind. We mutilate it and amend it to render it reasonable and harmless. We attempt to show how the prophets and Jesus show us a way to attain our own ends which is superior to other ways. We explain the Bible away, psychologically, historically, and practically.

In all this we are on the wrong side of the fence. Modern educators are right in setting us apart as people engaged in an unrewarding enterprise. Assuming their perspective we cannot convince them that our enterprise has any value or future. Because it so happens that the Bible is largely irrelevant to the purposes of the modern mind and its temper is profoundly different from that of the latter. There seems to be just one way out of this

impasse—we must take the Bible seriously and teach it as we find it. We must present the Bible as the word of God, as the judgment of God concerning the world, as a warning and admonishing voice, we must be unwilling to reinterpret, to distort, to soften, to oblige. How can we do otherwise? Must we not teach our subject? There has been too much quarreling with the literalists. Let us forget it. There has been too much elation about the historical and critical approach to the Bible. Let us learn to accept it quietly and modestly. Let us now go forward and teach the Bible as we find it, let us help our students to understand the biblical mind, let us put before the world, the modern world, this record of God's dealings with man.

When treated in this way, the Bible can play an indispensable part in modern education in the following respects:

In the first place, it can turn our eyes once more beyond the temporal to the eternal. It can arouse in us once more that attitude of expectancy, receptivity, modesty, which is essential to wisdom. Such an attitude is possible only when men turn their minds to that vast and transcendent realm whence came all truth and excellence.

Secondly, by making God the center and the circumference of the mind, the Bible can cultivate in us that selflessness and objectivity which is essential to any genuine social-mindedness. There is no passing from self-centeredness to self-sacrifice. The two things belong to different tempers of mind and heart. The modern mind needs to be regenerated. It needs to be transformed from individualism to universalism, from subjectivism to objectivism, from self-love to the love of God. The Bible, with its theocentric perspective, is eminently suited for this purpose.

Thirdly, there is no necessary connection between social process and social progress. For progress society is dependent upon individuals who transcend the mind and the objectives of the well-adjusted thousands, men who see a light from God and hear His word, men who are mad and makers of trouble, men who descend upon society with burning words and destroying deeds. Such were the great men of the Bible. If we take them in earnest and help others to do the same, we let loose a social dynamic beside which all our tinkering with iniquity appear as child's play.

Fourthly, by taking men's minds off their

petty pursuit of practical success, by reducing particulars to their proper place in the scheme of eternity, by fixing attention to the relative character of all things mundane, by a true recognition of the transcendence of things ultimate and God's last end in creating the world —thus, and only thus, can we hope to arouse that sense of humor, that sense of proportion, that softening sense of vanity, that redeeming selflessness, which are essential to all true wisdom, understanding, generosity, love and peace. That poise and serenity, that victory over the world which comes from the elevation of the mind to the supernatural, that Christian stoicism which is the fruit of faith in God, that inner resourcefulness which is the consequence of dependence on God, that joy which is the love of God, and therefore of our neighbor, that perception of and submission to God, which are the first fruits of life eternal—it is these that we learn from the Bible and teach others.

It is evident that the word of God is our great hope for salvation. I will end this paper with a plea for a simple-hearted and humble approach to the Bible. Our duty is at once

tremendous and simple. We must transmit the message of the Bible. We must allow God to speak to us. Setting aside all feeling of superiority, undue preoccupation with the mere instruments of historical and literary criticism, we must seek to understand and perhaps appropriate the mind of the Bible. Then we shall come to our students not as professors of an antique faith and tellers of an unimportant and uninteresting tale, but as witnesses to eternal truth. We shall teach the Bible not as frightened apologists but as challenging voices warning a generation to listen to God.

Then we may be rejected, but we shall have done our duty. And God will provide. Let us have faith in God and in His word. I am no optimist to think that the world will receive us with open arms. Yet, I have faith in man because I have faith in God. I believe that if we, teachers of His word, will make ourselves worthy channels for the transmission of His truth, His spirit will move the hearts and minds of some men so that they will hear and understand and obey. Ours is a high calling.

## Some Principles Governing the Formulation of a College Bible Curriculum

By MARY E. LAKENAN, *Professor of Biblical Literature,  
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.*

TO those who are working towards the ideal of standardization of college biblical courses, an exchange of ideas regarding the fundamental principles on which the biblical curriculum should be based is of value. Accordingly, several principles determining the subject-matter and method of the courses in biblical Literature in one southern college for women are here presented.

**FIRST:** That religion can be taught, and that it must have a basis of informational subject-matter. The college has too little realized this truth, depending largely upon "religious atmosphere" to accomplish the desired results in character formation. "The fact is not yet fully recognized that a grounding of religious experience must rest upon basic religious concepts and knowledge, upon trained religious

attitudes, and upon religious conduct and actions resulting ultimately in religious habits . . . Religion like any other great complex of human experience must be taught if it is to become a significant element in national life and character."\*

**SECOND:** That higher institutions of learning have a distinct responsibility for the religious education of youth, a responsibility which rests with particular weight on the Christian college. "What you would have in the life of a people, you must first put into its schools." There is striking agreement these days among criminologists, statesmen and educators that the outstanding need of the day is religion in the life of our youth. They may not be willing to do anything about it, but they do not hesitate to express publicly this conviction. It might be expected that this need would be met by the home and the church

\*Betts, *The Curriculum and the College Department of Religion*, Religious Education, October, 1920, pp. 260-261.

school. The fact remains, however, that it is not. Anyone who has tested the religious knowledge of the average college freshman will grant that the work of religious preparation is pitifully undone. If the future leadership of the country is to be prepared to meet spiritual needs and stay the tide of utter materialism, opportunity must be afforded in the college curriculum for a grounding in religion. This may be done to some extent by elective courses in the universities. The opportunity of the Christian colleges, however, is peculiarly great, for they may include courses in religion among their requirements for graduation.

**THIRD:** That college Bible courses are only justified if of high standard academically. One feels as if it would not be too extreme, to say that a course in religion which does not command the intellectual respect of the student is demoralizing and a menace. Many of our finest potential leaders are using their influence against instead of for Christianity because their religious training was based only on a shallow emotionalism and did not satisfy their minds. Only as religion is made a matter of the mind as well as of the feelings and will can it have its complete meaning for thoughtful people.

**FOURTH:** That the Bible forms the foundation and core of Christian education, and a grounding in it should precede other courses in religion. "The text without equal for religious education, the inspirational centre of all other studies that develop the religious nature of man, is and will remain the Christian's Bible."\*

**FIFTH:** That the aim of college biblical courses should be three-fold:

(a) The mastery of such biblical knowledge as is an essential element in the cultural background of a college graduate.

(b) The attaining of such a viewpoint of life as to enable one to see its eternal spiritual values, and to hear its challenge to the consecration of his own life to those values in any career to which he may be called.

(c) The building of a foundation for future specialization on the part of those who shall go on to some graduate school of religion.

**SIXTH:** That a study of Old Testament History should be the foundation course for

college Bible. It is particularly important that the college student be given organized and connected subject-matter, in order that he may gain perspective and a sense of relationships. He should begin at the very first of his college career to secure a basis for the philosophy of history as well as for a philosophy of life, and the systematic study of the Old Testament history, preceding the equally systematic study of the New Testament, is a most satisfactory means for accomplishing this. In the Old Testament we have a surprisingly complete picture of human nature which is presented in almost every conceivable life-situation. The divine nature is clearly depicted as progressively discovered and comprehended by man. The Old Testament was Jesus' own Bible, furnishing largely the basis for His culture, the inspiration for His teachings, the ammunition for His temptations and the food for His spirit. "That which was used by the Redeemer Himself for the sustenance of His own soul can never pass out of the use of His redeemed."† Finally, it is impossible to understand the real meaning of Christ for the world without a comprehension of the need for Him and the preparation for His mission and it is given in "the law and the prophets."

**SEVENTH:** That the English Bible, as the basic subject-matter of the biblical courses, is, in the translation best adapted to student use (the American Standard Version) the most satisfactory text-book. Such supplementary reference books should be used as can function as tools for the better understanding of the Bible itself, but not as crutches which would make one independent of the source-book. These would include standard works on biblical geography, archaeology and oriental manners and customs.

**EIGHTH:** That the method of approach should be that of first-hand contact with the biblical record itself, which shall lead students to get their own results—to see "face to face" God's manifestations of Himself in His dealings with men and His revelation of human life and its meaning, rather than to see "as through a glass darkly"—the glass of expositors and commentators. A wise teacher of Shakespeare advised his class never to allow a wall of Shakespearean criticism to get between them and the master writer. In the margin of a carefully worked-out syllabus which

\*Horne, *The Psychological Principles of Education*, p. 411.

†Smith, G. A., *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, p. 18.

passed through the hands of Dr. Wilbert W. White before it reached the library appears this note: "Why not put them to work for results instead of *on* results?" All who have practiced this direct contact method of Bible study can testify to the freshness of interest and vitality it gives.

**NINTH:** That the spirit of approach should be that of open-minded search for truth; the desire to see what is there in its true relationships; without pre-conceptions to try to see what the writers of the record really meant. It is not difficult to arouse such a spirit. The Bible is to the average college student a land sufficiently unknown to challenge him with a real spirit of adventure and discovery.

**TENTH:** That books of the Bible should be regarded as related units, and as they are built into a developing conception of the whole, the distinctive contribution of each should be taken into consideration. The attempt should be made to cultivate a keen sense of logical relationships and to see history in its true perspective.

**ELEVENTH:** That assignments should be definite, clear-cut and designed to necessitate vigorous mental effort and concentrated application as well as to challenge the interest.

**TWELFTH:** Critical problems should not be thrust upon the student. His first impressions of the biblical record should be made by the Book itself, from its own point of view. Afterward such problems as arise inevitably should be discussed. A special course in critical problems should be given for the benefit of advanced students.

**THIRTEENTH:** Opportunity should be given

for full student participation and cooperation through class discussion. The purpose of this should be to make possible a vivid re-experiencing of the life of the race, and to encourage, without forcing, free and frank application of its findings to the life problems of today.

**FOURTEENTH:** The function of the teacher should be to give direction and inspiration to the work of the class, but not to be a dictator. The court of final resort should be, not what the instructor says or thinks, but what the Bible means as judged by its own point of view.

**FIFTEENTH:** That the college course in Bible must meet the life problems of the student. Too often have our youth been exposed for years to courses in religion without their lives and conduct being affected thereby. It is even possible for them to become hardened and calloused to all religious influence if their instruction does not make vital contacts with life. They may not be conscious of their deepest needs except through vague feelings of unrest or a sense of lack or limitation. Bringing these spiritual needs to consciousness is as definite a help as is presenting a basis for solving their problems. Both may be successfully accomplished indirectly through the study of the great biblical personalities and their life situations. These results will be "by-products." They will appear incidentally and casually but none the less inevitably and effectively.

NOTE: Many of the above principles are basic elements in the distinctive "method" of the Biblical Seminary in New York adapted to undergraduate use. To the Seminary and to Dr. W. W. White, its moving spirit, I acknowledge my deep indebtedness.

## Archaeological Discoveries in Palestine\*

PROFESSOR MILLAR BURROWS, *Brown University*

*Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, 1931-32*

**M**UCH has been written concerning archaeological confirmation of the Bible. In general it is true that archaeologists have found their confidence in the reliability of the biblical record increased by the results of excavation. Sometimes also confirmation of particular statements or presuppositions is found. The excavations at Jericho

and at Teleilat el-Ghassul, for example, have shown that there was a fairly advanced civilization in the region of the Dead Sea even earlier than the period in which it is presupposed by the story of Lot and Abraham. At Shiloh it has been found that the place was occupied and abandoned at times corresponding to what we read in the Bible. The Israelite city at Samaria was built upon a new site, as the account of Omri's purchase and use of

\*This and the following two papers are summaries of illustrated lectures given at the annual meeting of the NABI on December 27, 1932.

the hill for his capital would lead us to expect. On such points as these corroboration of the biblical account can often be found, though it is not true that archaeology invalidates the principles or the main results of modern literary and historical criticism.

Before we can say much about confirmation, however, we must settle many questions of interpretation. The difficulty with archaeological evidence is that often we cannot tell with certainty just what an object is or what it really signifies. A stone which looks like a *mazzebah* may have been one, but we can rarely if ever be sure. The "Third Wall" excavated at Jerusalem aroused much controversy because of its supposed relation to the site of Jesus' tomb. The evidence is solid and unshakable, but what it proves is subject to dispute.

Generally, instead of saying that the excavations confirm the biblical record, it would be better to say that they are compatible with it; that is, they can be interpreted in accordance with it. The stables found at Megiddo probably belonged to one of the cities built by Solomon for his chariots, yet we cannot say that their existence proves that Solomon had such chariot cities. The wall uncovered on Ophel may very well have been built by the Jebusites and the tower by King David, but this simply means that the excavators, assuming the accuracy of the biblical record, were able to interpret the archaeological material accordingly. The existence of these remains does not prove that the record is accurate, because we could interpret them differently. The most that we can say with certainty is that the results of excavation are compatible with the history as recorded in the Bible.

Occasionally historical problems can be solved by excavation. The fact that the Jerusalem of David's time was on the hill of Ophel has been quite definitely established. Chronological problems also may be solved by archaeology. On the basis of the pottery and scarabs found at Jericho, Garstang has established a strong case for dating the fall of the city at about 1400 B. C. Philological studies, of course, get much of their material from archaeology. Palestine has not been fertile in inscriptions, but a potsherd picked up in 1929 at Gezer, one found long ago at Tell el-Hesy, and a later one from Beth-shemesh

show that even the earliest forms of the alphabet were known in the country.

The study of the Bible gains a great deal from archaeology by way of illustration. Careful study of the remains of city walls and gates and of the houses of the people, such as have been found at Tell Beit Mirsim, Tell en-Nasbeh, and elsewhere, can tell us not a little about the life from which the literature of the Bible came. Implements, vessels, and weapons of various types and materials help to fill in the picture. Religion is illustrated by the numerous Astarte figurines and by such objects as the model of a shrine discovered at Beisan.

On the whole the most important contribution of the archaeologist to the student of the Bible is the authentic background for its interpretation, its proper setting in the life of the people. The cultural history of mankind is after all the primary concern of archaeology, and Palestine provides a wealth of material for the study of cultural development and intercultural relations. The story begins in the Stone Age, with the race whose skeletons were found in 1931 and 1932 in the caves east of Athlit. By the end of the Stone Age we find at Teleilat el-Ghassul a civilization with buildings of mud brick and unshaped stone, and even with mural paintings showing marked Egyptian influence.

At every turn Palestinian culture shows foreign influences. When works of purely local origin appear they are generally inferior to those of other countries, as is the Canaanite stone lion from Tell Beit Mirsim. In the stele found recently by Mr. Horsfield on the Moabite Plateau Egyptian influence is obvious. The lion stele of Beisan just as clearly reveals cultural contacts with the countries to the north. Cultural and commercial relations with Cyprus and the Aegean region are evident in the pottery of the Late Bronze Age.

At the beginning of the Iron Age the Philistines brought in a new culture from the same direction. With all the evidences of northern contacts, however, Egyptian influence was still strong in the days of the kings of Israel and Judah. The lovely ivory panels found last year at Samaria have both Egyptian and Mesopotamian (or Anatolian) affinities.

Cultural developments and relations in the later periods also may be illustrated by objects found in the excavations, but lack of time prevented a presentation of this material.

## Recent Excavations in Mesopotamia as Related to the Teaching of the Bible

MARY I. HUSSEY, *Professor in Mount Holyoke College*

*Annual Professor of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, 1931-32*

ONE of the pleasant duties of the Annual Professor of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem is to become as well acquainted as time may permit with the archaeology of the Near East. It was possible to visit Mesopotamia during the Christmas holidays, thanks to the saving of time afforded by modern facilities of travel. Stepping into an airplane in Damascus at 6 o'clock in the morning, we arrived in Baghdad four hours later, having flown over the Arabian desert, that great expanse of sand and black basalt. From the air the black tents of the Arabs look like black ants crawling along, and the caravan route—now the automobile road—a mere thread stretching endlessly in the sand. It is not my purpose to discuss the discoveries made in Mesopotamia during the last half century and their relation to the history, religion, and literature of the Old Testament, but rather to report quite simply and briefly a few of the things seen while visiting eight sites which were in process of excavation and four others where excavators have previously worked.

At the distance of a night's railway journey northward from Baghdad lies Nuzi, excavated by the Harvard-Baghdad School. Here have been found a central building with a large reception court, a kitchen with stoves and an elaborate drainage system. Nearby are small, well-built houses for the rich. Documents written in Assyrian dealing with the business activities of some of these families, afford material for the study of social and legal customs of the sixteenth century B. C. Professors Chiera and Speiser have shown that about the middle of the second millennium before Christ a population spread from the bend of the Euphrates eastward and across the Tigris, speaking a non-Semitic language but one which has affinities with a group of languages sometimes called Caucasian or Anatolian-Transcaucasian. Thus has been discovered a new racial factor in the population of the Near East. On a lower strata letters, business records, and a map were found from the early Agade period about 2600 B. C. At

that time Nuzi had a different name and an entirely different population, since most of the names in the documents from this period are West Semitic and Akkadian. A letter was found between these two strata, sent from Cappadocia in Asia Minor to Nuzi. This fact shows trade relations between Cappadocia and an Assyrian province. In short, this partially excavated site, while it raises many questions which cannot be definitely answered at present, throws light upon races living east of the Tigris for a thousand years, together with their trade relations. What is no less important to the historians are the Assyrian methods of provincial government.

Seven hours by automobile northwest of Nuzi and on the east bank of the Tigris lies Assyria's fourth capital, Nineveh, "that exceedingly great city of three days' journey." Beneath the platform of the palace of Sennacherib, the British Museum expedition is sinking a shaft seventy feet deep which shows that the occupation of this site goes back to the Neolithic Age. In the district of Nineveh the University of Pennsylvania and the Baghdad School are digging at Tell Billah and Tepe Gawra. The former is an Assyrian site while the eighth level of Gawra reveals a Neolithic town antedating the extensive remains of Mohenjo Daro on the Indus river in India. The intricate town plan, individual dwellings with windows and arches, and rooms paved with bitumen, compel us to revise our ideas of Neolithic life. A seal impression of a bearded man followed by a woman and behind both the figure of a snake antedates the writing of the J narrative of Genesis by some twenty-five hundred years. "The Gawra seal," to quote Prof. Speiser, the excavator, "evidently rests on some story, the burden of which is the doleful result of the association between two human beings and a serpent." What the fourteen strata beneath this level of Gawra VIII may bring forth, only time and the spade of the excavator can reveal. Assyria's second capital, Calah, is some twenty miles south of Nineveh. The massive ~~concrete~~ <sup>concrete</sup> temple tower may still be seen from a great distance.

Granite walls of royal palaces and human-headed bulls are now only half concealed by the earth.

In the neighborhood of Babylon expeditions were in the field at Kish, Seleucia, Ctesiphon and Eshnunna. The Oxford University and Field Museum Expedition have proved the existence of a very early civilization at Kish. At the lowest level just above virgin soil, flint implements have been found which suggest their use before copper-working was known. At the beginning of the third millennium kings ruled during whose reign picture script was still in use. The chronological bearing of these results is of very great importance.

To the traveler who has walked on Neolithic streets and seen walls erected before brick-making was invented, the impressive arch of Chosroes with its enormous height and span and with the remaining wing of the palace of the Sassanian kings at Ctesiphon seem like contemporary monuments. We regretted our inability to visit Seleucia, excavated by Professor Waterman for the Michigan-Baghdad School Expedition. Founded by Seleucus I, it waned before the rising power of Ctesiphon, on the opposite bank of the Tigris, but it did not lose the characteristics of a Greek colony.

The excavations of the University of Chicago at Tell Asmar, the ancient Eshnunna, illuminate the four centuries of history during which this small principality united with Elam and the Amorites to oppose Hammurabi's attempts at unification of the government of Mesopotamia. Owing to Sennacherib's destruction of the city of Babylon, little was to be found by the German excavators which belonged to a period earlier than Nebuchadnezzar II. Marduk's Procession Street which ran straight through the city from north to south is still spanned by the great Ishtar Gate. The intricate foundation walls of palaces and temples are silent witnesses to the greatness of that city situated at the meeting point of transcontinental routes of commerce from the second millennium until the rise of Seleucia.

In Lower Mesopotamia we visited the sites of Ur, al-'Ubaid, and Erech. At Ur a small railway station marked in English and in Arabic "Ur Junction" contrasts strangely with that impressive temple tower which has dominated the landscape for more than forty centuries. Its ~~ancient~~ <sup>ancient</sup> are oriented to the cardinal points of the compass, its massive core of unbaked brick rises to a present height of seventy

feet even though it has lost its two uppermost stories. The slightly receding slope of the recessed walls of burnt brick, the convergence on the second terrace of three stairways on the northeast face, each of one hundred steps, "lead the eyes upward to the shrine, which was the religious and artistic crown of the structure."

In an early cemetery is a pit which contained some seventy bodies, nearly all of whom were women. Their personal ornaments were of gold and semi-precious stone. The furniture has a beauty that recalls Egyptian furniture from a period two thousand years later. The harps have bands of gold, inlays of shell and lapis lazuli, and the fronts are surmounted by golden heads of animals. Golden vases show a purity of form rarely equalled. A gold dagger with a studded hilt, a helmet of beaten gold, and lamps of the same precious metal were found too. There is no reason to doubt that the wonderful gold objects of these tombs are prior to the first dynasty of Ur, i. e., before 3000 B. C. In another part of the cemetery a tomb was uncovered consisting of two rooms with vaulted roofs and two other rooms with corbel vaulting and arched doorways. Here we find the arch, the vault, and the dome, "forms which were not to find their way to the western world for thousands of years," to quote Mr. Woolley, who was excavating for the Joint Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania and the British Museum.

Four miles west of Ur is the site of a temple to the goddess of the underworld, built on the top of a platform. The entrance was flanked by life-sized heads of copper lions with teeth, red tongues and inlaid eyes. The walls of plano-convex bricks were decorated with three friezes. One was a copper frieze of bulls in relief, another a milking scene in white stone or shell set against a background of black shale. This milking scene shows the domestic life of the time, while the former scene is witness to the stage to which copper work had advanced by about 3000 B. C. "The practice of metal working as known to us in Western Asia throughout the centuries before the Hellenistic age represents no great technical advance on this work" is the verdict of Mr. Sydney Smith.

A German expedition has been working on the site of the biblical Erech, the modern Warka, where there are three mounds, one from the Seleucid period, another is Eanna,

the temple tower sacred to the goddess Innini, and the third and oldest is sacred to Anu-Antu. The remarkable discoveries of Dr. Jordan and Dr. Noeldeke reveal the continuity of achievement from the Hellenistic period back to the pre-historic period of painted pottery. A wall construction of mud, banked up wet and into which were inserted baked flasks or cones to make a protection revetment, is more fully represented here than in any other site yet excavated. A shaft sunk seventy-two feet from what the excavators regard as the 4000 B. C. level passes through layer after layer of pottery until it reaches virgin soil, on which the accumulation of reeds is evidence that the earliest settlers lived in reed huts.

No one is at present prepared to set the date of the arrival of the first inhabitants of the valley of the Two Rivers. When the rapidly increasing material from these many mounds is classified, its outstanding stages of development are discernible. It now seems highly probable that the culture of Mesopotamia was created by the Sumerians, so-called because the inscriptions show that they spoke the Sumerian language, and that this culture is homogeneous from the foot of the Kurdish mountains to the Persian Gulf. Although created by the Sumerians, it was assimilated by other groups which settled in the valley, notably by men of a definitely Semitic type at the Agade period (about 2600 B. C.) and at the time of the first dynasty of Babylon (about 2000). The whole civilization of Babylonia and Assyria is rooted in the past and Sumerian culture did not die with the race which produced it.

What has this to do with the teaching of the Bible? Contemporary records brought to light within the last century have remade Hebrew history. That Old Testament times can be understood only in connection with contemporary events in neighboring countries, especially Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and the land of Hittites, has long been a commonplace. Every year brings new sources of information and adds to the fullness of detail of this contemporary picture. But the culture which the Hebrews found in Palestine and which they assimilated was fixed in its main outlines long before the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan.

We have seen that the earliest settlers in the valley of the Two Rivers had implements and other objects made of copper, flint, obsidian, and limestone. In the dynastic period they used silver, gold, diorite, and lapis lazuli. Whence came these materials, for Mesopotamia's natural resources consist of shell, bitumen, and clay? Their food was supplied by the date palm, grain, flocks and herds. It is necessary to assume that some intercourse with surrounding countries existed even in the earliest period known to us. The sources of supply for these raw materials take us eastward to Persia and Beluchistan for lapis lazuli, up the Euphrates to Syria and Cappadocia for gold, to northern Cilicia for silver, and to the Caucasus mountains for copper. These materials could be obtained by trade or by war. The earlier, the more continuous, and more profitable method was trade. Commerce meant the spread of Mesopotamian culture over the whole region extending from the Persian gulf to the Mediterranean, Asia Minor, and the Transcaucasus. The economic interdependence of the several groups living in Asia Minor from the Neolithic Age onward makes it impossible to regard the development of any one of them as an isolated phenomenon. The most interesting recent contribution of Mesopotamian archaeology to biblical studies is in the changing and widening view which it presents to man's cultural past. Now Hebrew-Canaanitish development may be seen in perspective projected against a background of millennia of cultural development. Some sense of the homogeneity of civilization in Western Asia is found in the Hebrew traditions themselves with the story of the origin of civilization in the Tigris-Euphrates valleys and its spread to other regions. The cities of Ur and Erech are represented as going back to time immemorial. The stage tower is pictured as a distinctive feature, albeit an impious one, of the civilization of the plain of Shinar. It is superfluous to remark that emphasis upon the unity of the eastern world and the continuity of its civilization in no way detracts from the distinct individuality of its parts. Continuity is not synonymous with identity nor does diversity exclude unity.

## The Excavations at Old Beth Shemesh, Palestine

See I Samuel VI

PROFESSOR ELIHU GRANT, *Haverford College*

FOR four seasons the Haverford College Expedition has been exploring this mound which lies due west of Jerusalem, exactly half way between the city and the Mediterranean. It is on the edge of the hill country and fertile sea plain where Canaanites, Philistines and Hebrews crossed paths. It is in sight of the birthplace of Samson, the strong man. The Vale of Sorek is hard by.

There are about ten acres on the top of this hill and a strong wall encircled it 3,600 years ago. Now it is a grain field and is surrounded by level fields beyond the walls that stretch away for miles. An hour's walk away is a Moslem village of modern Canaanites and them we used to help us dig in the ruin-heap that represented the former town. Near the foot of the hill is a semi-abandoned mosh where we set up camp and headquarters for the technical staff.

During the first season we unearthed the

temple facing west. Behind it was a pottery kiln and around were streets, houses, cisterns, in many layers. Towns fell by fire, siege, and earthquake. The tops of houses buried the bases. Cemeteries just beyond the walls contained treasure along with the skeletons of former inhabitants. Many fine museum specimens of vases, lamps, jugs and other household wares besides imported objects that told of trade with Cyprus and other islands, with Egypt, so long the mistress of this province. There were jewels, scarabs, tools, weapons, bronze, alabaster, silver, gold, carnelian, and other stones were used. Seals, beads, amulets, charms, figurines, votive and secular objects are picked up in the dust. All testifies to a lively community, in touch with the world on every side and giving us a picture of those Canaanites from whom the Hebrews really learned a great deal in spite of the corruptions from which the Hebrew prophets tried to save their people.

### EDITORIAL

#### Greetings

THE JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS (NABI is the Hebrew word for prophet) of which the first issue herewith appears, was conceived and born in the troublesome times of the depression: if it can live now (and no one holding this issue in his hands can doubt that it is alive), it has every prospect of thriving as conditions improve.

THE JOURNAL has come into being as a natural product of the Association's history and development during the twenty-three years of its existence; and it must seem strange now that it did not appear long before. It is quite evident that we did not rush in the matter; and that its appearance now has come by mature and deliberate purpose.

The preparation for the appearance of the JOURNAL was made during the years of our

connection with *Christian Education* whose editor, Dr. Robert L. Kelly, is an active member of NABI and its friend. In the days of Charles Foster Kent, of blessed memory, the first president of NABI, *Christian Education* generously published our material, and for the last three years we shared its space under the caption: "Department of Biblical Instruction," edited by the Association's editorial secretary, who continues his duties now as editor of the JOURNAL.

It became increasingly evident, however, that our Association had age and character enough to stand on its own feet and walk in its own ways. The JOURNAL, it is believed, will bring the Association greater solidarity, growth, and efficiency in embodying its objects and ideals. It will be the record of our thought and activities; it will give permanence to our deliberations; it will be a store-house of our experiences to draw upon when needed;

and it will furnish a means for the interchange of thoughts on the various phases of biblical instruction.

We have no rival or competitor, and the field we cover is unoccupied. The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, to which many of our members belong, specializes in creative research. Ours is a humbler but none the less important function. It is ours to point out the ways and means by which to transmit the ever increasing volume of new discoveries and to apply it to the betterment of the social, ethical, economic, and spiritual life of individuals and society.

We do not share the views of those who hold, openly or tacitly, that the Bible and the religion it reveals are antiquated; we believe that biblical religion as culminating in the life, teachings, and regenerating power of Jesus is

the only solution of the problems of universal citizenship.

It is for these reasons that we would make our appeal for cooperation as emphatic and urgent as possible. The JOURNAL is not a commercial enterprise; our object is mutual aid to accomplish a common task—teaching the Bible in the best way possible. To those who think that they do not need our aid, we say we need yours.

"Moses said to Hobab '... come thou with us, and we will do thee good' ... and he said unto him, 'I will not go' ... and he said, 'Leave us not, I pray thee; forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou shalt be to us instead of eyes; and it shall be, if thou go with us, yea, it shall be, that what good soever Jehovah shall do unto us, the same will we do unto thee'."

—ISMAR J. PERITZ

## Report of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, 1932

THE twenty-third annual meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors was held at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, December 27-28, 1932. In the absence, on account of illness, of President Chester Warren Quimby, James Muilenburg, University of Maine, chairman of the Program Committee, read the presidential address and presided at all the sessions.

The program, considered by many the best in recent years, was as follows:

### TUESDAY, DECEMBER 27

#### *Morning Session*

President's Address, "The Word of God"—Professor Chester Warren Quimby, Dickinson College.

Committee Reports.

Luncheon at Refectory Cafeteria.

#### *Afternoon Session*

A School Principal's Reactions to the Problems of Biblical Instruction—Principal Mira B. Wilson, Northfield Seminary.

The Future of the Bible in the College and Seminary Curriculum—Professor Hugh Hartshorne, Yale University

The Bible and Modern Education—Mr. Joseph Haroutunian, Wellesley College.

Discussion.

6.30 p. m.—Dinner in Private Dining Room of Refectory.

*Evening Archaeological Session*  
Short Address—President Warren J. Moulton, Bangor Theological Seminary.

Recent Discoveries in Palestine (Illustrated)—Professor Millar Burrows, Brown University.

Recent Excavations in Mesopotamia as Related to the Teaching of the Bible (Illustrated)—Professor Mary I. Hussey, Mount Holyoke College.

Beth Shemesh (Illustrated)—Professor Elihu Grant, Haverford, College.

### WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28

#### *Morning*

Business Session

Symposium: The Bible in Modern Education  
The Scientific Approach—Professor George Dahl, Yale.

The Social Approach—Professor Ralph Harlow, Smith.

The Ethical Approach—Professor Georgia Harkness, Elmira.

The Shortcomings of the Scientific Method—Professor Howard Howson, Vassar.

The Place of the Bible in the College Curriculum—Professor Henry T. Fowler, Brown.

## Items of Business:

It was voted by the Association that the office of vice president should be created.

The report of the treasurer (printed elsewhere in this issue) was read and accepted.

## Committee reports:

(1) *The committee appointed to take up the matter of credits for work in preparatory schools toward college entrance, with the ultimate objective of securing college board entrance examinations.* Herbert L. Newman, Colby, chairman, reported progress, and the committee was continued for another year. (The complete report is printed in full in this issue of the JOURNAL.)

(2) *The committee appointed to investigate the improvement of appointment facilities.* Katherine L. Richards, Smith, chairman, reported that few, if any agencies, outside the one conducted through the office of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education, exist at the present time for teachers in the field of the Bible and religion. The committee did not find it advisable to assume the burden of conducting such an appointment bureau. See report.

(3) *The committee appointed to approach the Institute of Social and Religious Research to propose an investigation of the relationship between theological schools and departments of Bible and religion.* In the absence abroad of the chairman, Chaplain R. C. Knox of Columbia, Mrs. Mary Ely Lyman, Barnard-Union Theological Seminary, reported a visit to the office of the Institute. Dr. Galen Fisher was quoted as stating that such an investigation had already been made in connection with a larger piece of research, and that the desired information was already available for reading by anyone interested and would be published in connection with the larger survey in the late spring or early fall of 1933. The committee was continued with the request that it make available to members of the Association the desired information, perhaps through the columns of the proposed JOURNAL.

(4) *The committee appointed to investigate the status of biblical instruction.* Elmer W. K. Mould, Elmira, chairman, reported that the work with which the committee was charged had already been undertaken under the direction of Professor Hugh Hartshorne of Yale and that the Yale Survey was about to appear. At the suggestion of the committee, Professor Hartshorne was invited to

participate in the program and describe the results of his research. An abstract of Prof. Hartshorne's address appears in this JOURNAL.

(5) *The committee on relations with the Association of Teachers of Religion.* Chester Warren Quimby, Dickinson, acting chairman of the committee, reported in a letter read by the presiding officer that no progress had been made and moved that the committee be discharged, which was voted.

(6) *The committee appointed to consider publication of a separate journal.* Chester Warren Quimby, chairman, in a letter read by the presiding officer, urged careful consideration of the need for such action. After considerable discussion, it was voted that the N. A. B. I. should publish a journal, to be a quarterly, eventually, but for the present year to be limited to one or two issues as finances permit. It was voted that the character of the journal be left to the discretion of the editors. It was later voted that the title of the journal should be **THE JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS**.

(7) *The committee appointed to increase membership in secondary schools.* S. B. Knowlton, Haverford School, chairman, reported that a circular letter addressed to secondary school teachers had resulted in six or eight additions. He recommended that in the future the task of increasing membership be recognized as the responsibility of the entire membership of the N. A. B. I. rather than of a single individual or committee. The report was accepted but Mr. Knowlton was requested to continue to direct a membership campaign in secondary schools in cooperation with the executive committee.

Officers for 1933 were elected as follows, adopting the report of the nominating committee, George Dahl, Yale, chairman:

*President:* James Muilenburg, University of Maine.

*Vice President:* Mira B. Wilson, Northfield Seminary.

*Secretary-Treasurer:* Carl E. Purinton, Adelphi.

*Program Committee:* Elmer W. K. Mould, Elmira, chairman; Katherine B. Richards, Smith; Maude L. Strayer, Master's School.

*Editor of the Journal:* I. J. Peritz, Syracuse.

*Associate Editor of the Journal:* Millar Burrows, Brown. Respectfully submitted,  
CARL E. PURINTON, Secretary

**Annual Report of Treasurer**

New York City  
December 28, 1932

Balance on hand, January 1, 1932 ..... \$ 93.36  
Receipts from dues during 1932 ..... 311.00

\_\_\_\_\_  
\$404.36

**EXPENDITURES***For the year 1931*

Christian Education subscription bill... \$ 54.03  
Toward space in Christian Education

for 1931 ..... 100.00

Programs and notices for 1931 meeting 8.70

*For the year 1932*

Christian Education (subscription bill) 113.60

Christian Education (subscription bill) 24.50

Postage ..... 34.52

Stationery (letterheads, billheads, etc.) 17.40

Clerical assistance ..... 9.00

Miscellaneous ..... 13.88

\_\_\_\_\_  
Total expenditures ..... \$375.63

\_\_\_\_\_  
\$404.36

\_\_\_\_\_  
375.63

Balance on hand ..... \$ 28.73

Respectfully submitted,  
CARL E. PURINTON, Treasurer

**Report of the Committee on Credits for  
Work in Preparatory Schools To-  
ward College Entrance**

Your committee was chosen "to take up the matter of credits for work in preparatory schools toward college entrance, with the ultimate objective of securing college entrance board examinations."

As the year progressed seven areas for study emerged, as follows:

(1) To study the history of similar investigations for their bearing on our procedure.

(2) To study the colleges, universities and junior colleges to determine which institutions now grant entrance credit for Bible study, and on what conditions such credit is recognized.

(3) When entrance is not given to attempt to ascertain the reasons against such granting of credit; also, to see what changes in the quality of pre-college work will be necessary for such credit.

(4) To study the preparatory schools for such data as may be available on the quality of work done on the pre-college level.

(5) To study the difficulties in the way of college board examinations.

(6) To find out the attitude of the college entrance examination board on college board examinations in Bible.

(7) To gather information about the leading experiments in our areas of study.

What has been accomplished in these studies?

(1) With the aid of Dr. Robert Kelly and others the records of similar investigations have been studied. Three achievements have especially come to our attention.

a. The effort of the four women's colleges—Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley—to join together in making out examination questions every spring, setting a date for such examinations to be given, and seeing to it that a committee is appointed, with two members from the colleges and one member from some girls' preparatory school.

b. The recognition by the colleges over a single state, as in Maine, where Dr. Herbert R. Purinton, Mrs. L. B. Costello, and Dr. Carl E. Purinton have experimented with and written four books that have become the basis for work accredited by all the colleges and the state university after examination.

c. The recognition of credit over a wide area. Of this Dr. Kelly writes: "Our greatest achievement perhaps in this line was in securing recognition for our unit of Bible study as meeting the entrance requirement for admission to all of those colleges affiliated with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools."

(2) Questionnaires have been printed and sent to every college, university and junior college in the United States. About three hundred of these are already in hand and they are coming every day. About 40 per cent are already returned with the prospect of the most thorough study of the college situation yet made.

(3) The study of the preparatory school situation and the attitude of the college entrance examination board is under way but has not proceeded far enough for a detailed report.

Some significant findings have already come to light from the reports received.

(1) Seventy-seven per cent of the colleges and universities grant such credit. Seven per cent more grant Bible credit under unusual conditions. Thus only 16 per cent say "No" to the question: "Does your institution accept entrance credit for work previously done in Bible?"

(2) Of the 16 per cent reporting No some interesting comments were received, a few of which are included here.

In nine institutions there is no problem for the reason that Bible credit is seldom or never requested.

Eight others are open to accepting duly accredited work in Bible.

Five are willing to grant such credit on the basis of the college entrance board examinations.

Only one institution, the University of Washington, is forbidden by the state constitution from acknowledging Bible credit.

The 1933 catalogue of the University of Mississippi will show one unit of Bible as acceptable.

From Bucknell comes this word: "Under our new arrangement high school credits in Bible would not be considered as separate credits but as helping to set the achievement record of the candidate."

Thus it would appear that the wayward 16 per cent is much more friendly disposed than is at first in evidence.

The chief difficulties in the way of granting credit are:

(1) The proper classification of credit (Ancient or Sacred History, English Literature, Bible, etc.).

(2) The negligible amount of entrance credit requested.

(3) The difficulty of executing entrance examinations in Bible, principally due to the dearth of applicants.

(4) The guidance of the junior college by the procedure of the university to which most of the students transfer.

(5) The suspicion on the part of college and university administrators that pre-college studies in Bible may not be on a par with other subjects in the secondary school curriculum. Hence the unusual discrimination as to schools and the attention to the merits of each case.

(6) The accreditation of teachers other

than those regularly employed on school faculties.

Apparently there is opened a great door and effectual, for the accrediting of pre-college Bible study when the quality of such study is commendatory and on a par with other accredited subjects.

Your committee is willing to proceed with its inquiry, interpret its findings, and publish the same in *Christian Education* or in some other manner if this Association so orders.

Respectfully submitted,

MISS CLAUDINE CLEMENTS

S. B. KNOWLTON

HERBERT L. NEWMAN,

Chairman

P. S.—A copy of the questionnaire sent to the colleges and universities is herewith attached.

December 27, 1932.

Union Theological Seminary

National Association of Biblical Instructors  
*A Study in Bible Credit for College Entrance*

Name of Institution .....

Location .....

This study of college entrance credits in Bible is sponsored by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. A committee appointed for this purpose will appreciate your cooperation in supplying us with the following data:

1. Does your institution accept entrance credit for work previously done in Bible? Yes ( ), No ( ). Number of units .....
2. On what conditions?
  - a College entrance board examination?
  - b Bible courses in preparatory school on a par with other curriculum courses?
  - c Church School credit courses with instructors and examinations approved? (By whom approved?)
  - d Credits from designated preparatory schools? (Please list schools).
  - e Above required 15 units?
  - f Other conditions?
3. What is the attitude of the administration to this plan?
4. If no entrance credit in Bible is now given, on what conditions would such credit be accepted by your institution?

Information furnished by .....

Address .....

Please return this information to Professor

Herbert L. Newman, 2 West Court, Waterville, Maine.

Committee of the N. A. B. I.

Claudine Clements

S. B. Knowlton

Herbert L. Newman, Chairman

### Report of the Committee on the Improvement of Placement Facilities for Colleges and Secondary Schools

At present the filling of positions in the field of biblical instruction is a haphazard process, to judge by the testimony submitted to this committee. Inquiries as to possible candidates may be made to officials or friends in theological seminaries, to the Bible departments of colleges, to the National Council of Religion in Higher Education and, less often, to appointment bureaus, either commercial or those of certain graduate schools. The records of their own graduates at work in this field are also investigated by colleges with positions to fill. The most important factor, however, is personal contact by some member of the employing institution with the candidate; next in weight is the recommendation of an individual or group whose judgment is trusted by the employing institution. With contact thus established, Graduate School Appointment Bureaus are appealed to for records and recommendations. Theological seminaries and the National Council on Religion in Higher Education, in their turn, take the initiative in proposing candidates for vacancies known to them.

In the secondary schools the teacher of Bible, more often than not, is expected to teach another subject as well, with the other subject as his major responsibility. Where there is a teacher giving full time to biblical instruction the school is concerned to secure a person who not only has command of his subject matter but who by his personality shall recommend to his students the religious values associated with the Bible. Registration of candidates with the National Council on Religion in Higher Education was the one suggestion for the improvement of the existing situation offered by a secondary school.

The colleges with Departments of Bible seem most aware of the confusion in the placement of instructors. Four out of the seven replying to the committee's letter proposed a

central bureau at which the names and qualifications of candidates for positions might be filed. Yet it is clear that when vacancies occur in the departments of these institutions they use existing bureaus only if the more personal methods of contact fail. The theological seminaries report a limited number of students interested in this field and have apparently found little difficulty in placing them.

The most illuminating comments on the situation which the committee received came from Dr. Richard Edwards of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education. They are in part as follows:

The officers and fellows of the Council do what they can to help in placing other fellows who are available. It is largely a person to person affair, although once or twice a year we send out letters to institutions letting them know that we have a certain number of people in each one of the major fields of our interest, available.

I find that the most effective placement agencies are connected with the various graduate school departments. Deans and professors in such schools do all they can to place their product, but they, for the most part, have not systematized this work to anything like the degree that they might do.

It might be that an endowed agency with branches in each main region of the country is the greatest single need in this connection, but where is the money? For the present about the only way that this highly personal matter can be worked out seems to be through one's friends, professors and the administrative officers of graduate schools or colleges with which one has been connected.

On the basis of this evidence the committee feels that it would be unwise for the Association to take steps looking toward the establishment of a placement bureau of its own, because there are already in existence agencies to which institutions are accustomed to turn, and because the establishment and maintenance of such a bureau would involve a financial burden beyond the resources of the Association while the small number of openings in a year preclude the possibility of self-support. The committee also questions the

publication of lists of names and positions because this does not meet the demand which is for more detailed and trustworthy data than are now available and because again the Association has no medium in which it can afford to publish such a list.

For positive action the committee suggests that individual members of the Association, as they have opportunity, seek to improve the placement facilities in their own institutions, that they make more exacting demands upon

the agencies to which they refer for candidates and that they facilitate the exchange of personal recommendation and contact on which the matter of placement rests at present. The committee also suggests that the Association hold itself in readiness to cooperate with other agencies whenever proposals for the unification of efforts toward the placement of instructors in Bible in schools and colleges may occur.

D. HELEN WOLCOTT  
KATHARINE L. RICHARDS, *Chairman*

### Members of the Association \*

Prof. David E. Adams, B. D., D. D., Mount Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.  
 Prof. William F. Albright, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Prof. Alfred E. Alton, Colgate College, Hamilton, N. Y.  
 Prof. Mary E. Andrews, Ph. D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.  
 Prof. W. E. Bachman, D. R. E., D. D., 3541 No. Meridian St., Indianapolis, Ind.  
 Prof. Albert E. Barnett, Ph. D., Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tenn.  
 Prof. George A. Barton, Ph. D., 4243 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Prof. Henry L. Beam, A. M., D. D. (Heidelberg College), 231 E. Market St., Tiffin, Ohio.  
 Prof. Dwight M. Beck, Ph. D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.  
 Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Ph. D., Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.  
 Prof. Marion J. Benedict, Ph. D., Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.  
 Prof. S. A. Bennett, Elon College, Elon College, N. C.  
 Prof. John Biegeliesen, M. A. (Eden Theological Seminary), 119 Bompart Ave., Webster Groves, Mo.  
 Prof. J. S. Bixler, Ph. D., Smith College, Northampton, Mass.  
 Prof. Hoyt Blackwell, Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, N. C.  
 Prof. Charles M. Bond, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.  
 Prof. E. P. Booth, Ph. D. (Boston University School of Religious Education), 20 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.  
 Prof. M. E. Bratcher, 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Calif.  
 Prof. H. A. Brautigam (Vassar College), 16 College Ave., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
 Prof. Raymond R. Brewer, Ph. D., College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.  
 Prof. J. E. Briggs, B. D., D. D., Benedict College, Columbia, S. C.  
 Mrs. Beatrice Allard Brooks, Ph. D., Western College, Oxford, Ohio.  
 Prof. Raymond C. Brooks (Pomona College), 489 W. 6th St., Claremont, Calif.  
 Prof. Henry L. Brumbaugh, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.  
 Prof. L. W. Buchholz, M. A., University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.  
 Rev. W. L. Burdick, Corresponding Secretary, Seventh Day Baptist Missionary Society, Ashaway, R. I.  
 Prof. Millar Burrows, Ph. D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
 Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Ph. D. (Bryn Mawr College), 3 College Circle, Haverford, Pa.  
 Prof. Patrick H. Carmichael, D. D., Ph. D., Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.  
 Prof. L. L. Carpenter, Ph. D., Limestone College, Gaffney, S. C.  
 Prof. Adelaide Case, Ph. D., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
 Prof. Maynard L. Cassidy, M. A., B. D. (University of Rochester), 169 Avalon Drive, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Chaplain Roy B. Chamberlin, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.  
 Dean W. G. Chanter, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.  
 Prof. Edward C. Chipman (Colgate University), 21 Pleasant St., Hamilton, N. Y.

\*This list has been corrected to May 22, 1933. Members are requested to notify the Secretary-Treasurer, Carl E. Purinton 13 Avon Place, Hempstead, N. Y., of any corrections or changes of address.

Rev. C. A. Choate, B. D., B. A. (Cambridge), Williamsport Dickinson Seminary, Williamsport, Pa.

Prof. James T. Clelland (Amherst College), 16 Taylor St., Amherst, Mass.

Prof. F. W. Clelland (Boston University School of Religious Education), 34 Madison Ave., Newtonville, Mass.

Miss Claudine E. Clements, M. A., Ph. D., National Cathedral School, Washington, D. C.

Prof. Margaret B. Crook, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Prof. Muriel S. Curtis, B. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

Prof. A. Bruce Curry, Ph. D., Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Gerald D. Cushing, Hebron Academy, Hebron, Maine.

Prof. George Dahl, Ph. D. (Yale Divinity School), 91 Linden St., New Haven, Conn.

Prof. J. Franklin Davis, Guilford College, N. C.

Prof. Frank Leighton Day, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.

Prof. John P. Deane, M. A., Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin.

Prof. Mary DeBardeleben, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

Dean Dora K. Degen (Alfred University), 33 So. Main St., Alfred, N. Y.

Prof. Walter B. Denny, Ph. D., Russell Sage College, Troy, N. Y.

Prof. J. R. Denyes, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin.

Prof. F. M. Derwacter, Ph. D., (William Jewell College) 202 W. Franklin St., Liberty, Mo.

Miss Jeanette DeYoung, Chatham Hall, Chatham, Va.

Prof. George S. Duncan, Ph. D. (Graduate School of American University), 2900 7th St., N. E., Washington, D. C.

Prof. Louise S. Eby, Ph. D., Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.

Prof. Calvert N. Ellis (Juniata College), 1002 Mifflin St., Huntingdon, Pa.

Prof. Morton S. Enslin, Th. D., 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa.

Prof. David E. Faust, B. D., Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.

Prof. M. Hadwin Fischer, Ph. D., Th. D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Prof. John W. Flight, Ph. D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Prof. Florence Fitch, Ph. D. (Oberlin College) 97 Elm Street, Oberlin, Ohio.

Mrs. M. G. Folsom (Maine Central Institute, Lock Box 236, Pittsfield, Maine.

Prof. William M. Forrest, University of Virginia, University, Va.

Prof. Hazel E. Foster (Presbyterian College of Christian Education), 815 Belden Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph. D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.

Prof. M. E. Frampton, Ph. D., College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.

Prof. Robert R. Fritsch, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

Prof. F. W. Gingrich, Albright College, Reading, Pa.

Prof. Allen H. Godbey, Ph. D., Rt. 1, Hillsboro, N. C.

Miss Beatrice L. Goff, 69 Stratford Road, Melrose, Mass.

Prof. Frederic S. Goodrich, A. M., D. D., Albion College, Albion, Mich.

Miss Mary E. Gordon, M. A., Rust Hall, 1150 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.

Prof. William Creighton Graham, Ph. D., D. D., 216 Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Elihu Grant, Ph. D., Apt. 99, 45 E. 9th St., New York, N. Y.

Prof. Charles J. Greene, D. D. (Hendrix College), 1221 Clifton St., Conway, Ark.

Prof. Ross J. Griffith, A. M., B. D. (Phillips University), Box 2221, University Station, Enid, Oklahoma.

Prof. Ivan G. Grimshaw, B. D., M. A., College of Emporia, Emporia, Kansas.

Mr. R. M. Gummere, Headmaster, William Penn Charter School, Pinehurst, Germantown, Pa.

Prof. W. M. Hall, Ph. D., Franklin & Marshall Academy, Lancaster, Pa.

Miss Hall's School, Pittsfield, Mass.

Prof. Georgia Harkness, Ph. D. (Elmira College), 313 W. Sixth St., Elmira, N. Y.

Principal Walter W. Haviland, Friends' Select School, Parkway and 17th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Pres. E. J. Heath, D. D., Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Pa.

Prof. Geo. P. Hedley, Th. D., (Pacific School of Religion), 1798 Scenic Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

Prof. Charles B. Hedrick, D. D., Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Carl V. Herron, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

Prof. H. I. Hester, Th. D., William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

Pres. Ralph K. Hickok, A. M., D. D., Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio.

Prof. John G. Hill (University of Southern California), 3551 University Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.

Prof. Roy W. Hodges, B. D., Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.

Prof. Norman A. Holmes (Straight College), 2307 Bienville Ave., New Orleans, La.

Prof. Horace T. Houf, L. H. D. (Ohio University), 165 N. Lancaster St., Athens, Ohio.

Prof. J. Howard Howson, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Prof. Mary I. Hussey, Ph. D., Mount Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.

Prof. Arthur J. Jackson, Th. D. (The American University), 407-4115 Wisconsin Ave., Washington, D. C.

Prof. Fleming James, Ph. D., D. D., Berkeley Divinity School, 4 Mansfield St., New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Leonard Z. Johnson, B. D., D. D. (Howard University), 1236 Harvard St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Miss Alice W. Jones, Oak Grove Seminary, Vassalboro, Me.

Mr. A. Willard Jones, Asheville School, N. C.

Mr. E. E. Jones, Northfield Seminary, E. Northfield, Mass.

Prof. Moses Jung, Ph. D., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

Prof. Edwin H. Kellogg, B. D., Ph. D., Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

Prof. Thomas S. Kepler (Mount Union College), 544 Vincent Blvd., Alliance, Ohio.

Pres. Willis J. King, Gammon Theo. Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.

Prof. Carl Sumner Knopf, Ph. D. (University of Southern California), 3551 University Park, Los Angeles, Calif.

S. B. Knowlton, The Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.

Chaplain R. C. Knox, S. T. D., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Prof. Ernest R. Lacheman, B. D., Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Mary E. Lakenan, M. A., Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.

Prof. Elbert C. Lane, D. D. (Hartford Theological Seminary), 69 Tremont St., Hartford, Conn.

Prof. J. H. Langenwalter, S. T. M., D. D., Friends University, Wichita, Kansas.

Dean Frank Glenn Lankard, Ph. D., Brothers College, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

Prof. Paul F. Laubenstein, S. T. M. (Connecticut College), 722 Williams St., New London, Conn.

Prof. H. F. Legg, Evansville College, Evansville, Ind.

Chaplain R. L. Lewis, U. S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn.

Mr. S. B. Linhart (Secretary of the University of Pittsburgh), 100 State Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Pres. A. E. Look, Ph. D. (Ellis College), Newtown Square, Pa.

Prof. L. R. Loomis, Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.

Prof. Mary Ely Lyman, Ph. D. (Union Theological Seminary and Barnard College), 606 West 122nd St., New York, N. Y.

J. P. McCallie, Ph. D., Headmaster, The McCallie School, Missionary Ridge, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Prof. Selby Vernon McCasland, Ph. D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.

Dean Lee S. McCollester, 48 Professors Row, Tufts College, Mass.

Mr. Walter R. Marsh, Headmaster, St. Paul's School, Garden City, N. Y.

Prof. Martha Martin (Elizabethtown College), 68 E. Washington St., Elizabethtown, Pa.

Prof. Henry H. Meeter, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. R. P. Miller, The George School, George School, Pa.

Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould, M. A. (Elmira College), 503 Fitch St., Elmira, N. Y.

Dean James Muilenburg, Ph. D., University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

Prof. H. E. Myers, S. T. M., Duke University, Durham, N. C.

Prof. Thomas Kinloch Nelson, M. A., D. D., Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.

Prof. Charles F. Nesbitt (Millsaps College), 1403 N. West St., Jackson, Miss.

Prof. Warren N. Nevius, D. D., Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.

Prof. H. L. Newman, Colby College, Waterville, Me.

Miss Helen R. H. Nichol, The Master's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.

Miss Caroline L. Nicholson, Ass't Principal, Westtown School, Westtown, Pa.

Mr. George Nicholson, Headmaster, Kingswood School, West Hartford, Conn.

Prof. O. M. Norlie, Ph. D., Litt. D. (Director of the Graduate and Bible Schools of Harkwick Seminary), 132 St. James Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Prof. John B. Noss (Franklin and Marshall College), 520 West James St., Lancaster, Pa.

Miss Ellen S. Ogden, Secretary, Seabury House, Milford, Mass.

Prof. John Orr, Ph. D. (Westminster College), 533 S. Market St., New Wilmington, Pa.

Prof. Wilfred T. Packer, B. D., Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio.

Prof. R. R. Paty, Emory University, Ga.

Rev. Endicott Peabody, D. D., LL. D., Groton School, Groton, Mass.

Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph. D., Litt. D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. H. A. Peters, University School, N. E. Cor. Claythorne and Brantley Roads, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rev. Ellis E. Pierce, A. M., Th. D., Auburn, N. Y.

Dean William H. Powers, Hendricks Chapel, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

Prof. Alexander C. Purdy, Ph. D. (Hartford Theological Seminary), 96 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn.

Prof. Carl E. Purinton, Ph. D. (Adelphi College), 13 Avon Place, Hempstead, N. Y.

Prof. Herbert R. Purinton, B. D., D. D. (Bates College), 144 Nichols St., Lewiston, Me.

Prof. W. E. Purvis (Grove City College), Ketler Dormitory, Grove City, Pa.

Prof. Charles Lynn Pyatt, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

Prof. Chester Warren Quimby, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

Prof. Katharine L. Richards, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Prof. Frank H. Ridgley, Ph. D., Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Pa.

Miss Narola E. Rivenburg (The Baptist Institute), 1421 Snyder Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. G. E. Robbins (Vt. Council of Religious Education), 455 Shelburne Rd., Burlington, Vt.

Prof. Walter E. Roush, M. A., B. D., (Bonebrake Theological Seminary), 2125 Rugby Rd., Dayton, Ohio.

Dean Elbert Russell, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.

Prof. P. J. Rutledge, Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.

Mr. William L. Savage, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, N. Y.

Prof. Charles R. Sauter, A. M., S. T. B., 1100 S. Goodman St., Rochester, N. Y.

Prof. L. B. Schenck, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.

Pres. A. T. Schulmair, A. M., S. T. B., Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.

Prof. Stanley Scott, Ph. D., New Norway, Alberta Canada.

Prof. William Scott, Th. D., Randolph-Macon College, Lynchburg, Va.

Rev. Delton L. Scudder (Wesleyan University), Durham, Conn.

Prof. Ovid R. Sellers, Ph. D., Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill.

Prof. S. M. Sewell, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, Tex.

Prof. Edwin Shaw, Milton College, Milton, Wis.

Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, Ph. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

Prof. Robert Seneca Smith, Ph. D. (Yale Divinity School), 64 Swarthmore St., New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Earl E. Speicher, Ph. D., Northland College, Ashland, Va.

Prof. Chas. D. Spotts, 834 Buchanan Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Prof. Wallace N. Stearns, Ph. D., 609 W. Main St., Urbana, Ill.

Dean James S. Stevens, LL. D., Litt. D., University of Maine, Orono, Me.

Prof. Harris B. Stewart, Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

Prof. Russell W. Stine, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

Prof. Mortimer M. Stocker, Albany College, Albany, Oregon.

Prof. S. Warren Sturgis, Groton School, Groton, Mass.

Prof. Maude L. Strayer, Master's School, Dobbs-Ferry, N. Y.

Prof. G. V. Stryker, The American International College, Springfield, Mass.

Prof. Alma Willis Sydenstricker, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga.

Prof. George S. Tarry, Randolph Macon College, Ashland, Va.

Prof. J. B. Tidwell, 1309 So. 8th St., Waco, Texas.

Prof. Godfrey Tietze, University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Mr. Clarence E. Tobias Jr., Friends' Central School, Overbrook, Pa.

Prof. Russell C. Tuck, A. M., S. T. M. (Andover Newton Theological School), 154 Institution Avenue, Newton Centre, Mass.

Union College of British Columbia, Vancouver, B. C.

Prof. Guy Linwood Vannah (N. E. School of Theology), 17 Rockville Park, Roxbury, Mass.

Prof. J. M. Vance, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio.

Prof. George Handy Wailes, D. D. (Reformed Episcopal Seminary and School of Theology, Temple University), 517 S. 48th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. R. H. Walker (Ohio Wesleyan University), 173 Sandusky St., Delaware, Ohio.

Prof. Sigismund C. Walker, 5524 Perrier St., New Orleans, La.

Principal George A. Walton, A. M., George School, George School, Pa.

Prof. O. W. Warmingham, S. T. B. (Boston University School of Religious Education), 20 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.

Prof. Leroy Waterman, Ph. D., Litt. D., Uni-

versity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Prof. William A. Weber, Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.

Mr. Lester P. White, Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.

Pres. W. W. White, Ph. D., D. D. (The Biblical Seminary), 235 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

Prof. S. E. Wicker, M. A., S. T. D. (The Philadelphia Lutheran Training School for Christian Workers), 2609 Madison St., Wilmington, Del.

Pres. J. M. Wilbur, D. D. (The Baptist Institute for Christian Workers), 1425 Snyder Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. Laura H. Wild, Mount Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.

Prof. Amos N. Wilder, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

Prof. Clyde E. Wildman, Ph. D., 72 Chester Road, Belmont, Mass.

Prof. Arthur Williams (Florida State College for Women), 524 West College Ave., Tallahassee, Fla.

Principal Mira B. Wilson, Northfield Seminary, East Northfield, Mass.

Prof. D. Helen Wolcott, Mount Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.

Prof. W. H. Wood, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

Prof. Harry York, Ph. D. (Dean of Elmira School of Religious Education), Elmira, N. Y.

Rev. Edgar C. Young, D. D., Th. D., 5817 Filbert St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. Rayborn L. Zerby, Ph. D. (Bates College), 410 Main St., Lewiston, Me.

## BOOK REVIEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE CAREER AND SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS. *Walter Bell Denny*, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York.

Here is a book some of us have been looking for, a comprehensive but concise life of Jesus strictly in accord with modern scholarship. It is really two books in one, giving sources, background and results of critical scholarship, and at the same time a vivid picture of the personality and achievement of

Jesus, an interpretation which is constructive and helpful. Here is an invaluable help for classes obliged to cover the whole Bible in a year and consequently spending only a few weeks on the Gospels.

The book is divided into two parts, Part I, The Career of Jesus; Part II, The Significance of Jesus. It is primarily for the student or teacher and not the general reader.

While Dr. Denny is very fair in mentioning

different phases and various interpretations of moot points he expresses his own views frankly. For example, he flatly asserts that he does not believe Jesus was himself "a thoroughgoing apocalyptic." This is in accord with the growing conviction of many of our sanest scholars such as Dr. Scott in his latest books and Dr. James McKinnon. Dr. Denny takes this position notwithstanding the fact that "a large number of the most eminent scholars today hold" the opposite and he shows in a few clear remarks that to him Jesus' ethical and spiritual messages seem inconsistent with such a view and transcend the beliefs of His disciples. He thinks Jesus fulfilled the "Suffering Servant" conception and whether he himself was conscious of it or not this was "the great spiritual discovery of His disciples." At the same time he does not slight his political interest.

Mr. Denny uses the titles which will mean the most to the beginner such as "The Teaching Source" rather than "Q." He strikes at the heart of an incident such as that of casting out the money-changers, and in a few words he focuses the attention upon the most significant interpretation. His simplicity gives the reader much pleasure and reminds one of the request of President Roosevelt recently when his technical advisers handed him a long report and he told them to reduce it to words of one syllable such as men like himself could understand. It took them two weeks to do it, so it is said. Dr. Denny wrote his whole book almost at one sitting, as it were, after the inspiration of Mrs. Lyman's address at the annual meeting of the N. A. B. I. in December 1931.

The book on the whole is excellently done and will be welcomed by members of our National Association as well as other Bible teachers.

Mount Holyoke College *Laura H. Wild*

**NEW TESTAMENT TIMES IN PALESTINE.** *Shailer Mathews.* The Macmillan Company. 307 pages 8vo. \$2.00.

This is a new and revised edition of a very familiar and much used textbook. It has retained all its former excellencies and has been brought up to date, particularly noticeable in the references to the most recent literature, like Klausner, Moore, Bousset, and even the in some quarters despised Weber. For a brief treatment of the subject there is no more serv-

iceable book; and until an English new Schuerer or Bousset appears, it is indispensable.

Syracuse University *Ismar J. Peritz*

**A HISTORY OF ISRAEL.** 2 vols. By *T. H. Robinson and W. O. E. Oesterley.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 496 + 500.

The importance of this history is very great indeed. For many years there has been a crying need for such a text, adapted to student requirements, which should go into greater detail than the works hitherto available. It seems clear that the two volumes under review will long remain the standard textbook on this subject. On the whole, they well deserve this place of leadership. Especially is this true of the first volume, that by Robinson. It is well arranged, appreciative and ably written. If it suffers from lack of assimilation of some recent literature, especially in the field of archaeology, that defect can be remedied in later editions. Oesterley's volume, partly perhaps because of the refractory nature of the source material, does not produce quite so happy an impression. In the treatment of

## **TWO TESTED TEXTS** **Common Objections to** **Christianity**

*By C. L. Drawbridge*  
*Revised Edition*

A book by an Anglican, used in Lutheran, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Methodist colleges of our country is worth considering as a textbook on Apologetics.

312 pages, 8vo. Price \$2.50

## **The Archaeology of the** **Old Testament**

*By Edouard Naville*

"A critical study of the age and composition of the books of the Old Testament in the light of some recent discoveries . . . It is commended as a fine contribution in this particular field."

*Prof. J. McKee Adams, Louisville.*  
212 pages, 8vo. Price \$1.75

**SAMUEL R. LELAND, INC.**  
129 Park Row *New York City*

Second Isaiah and Ezekiel, furthermore, it would seem that mention at least should be made of Torrey's important researches in these books. In spite, however, of these limitations, this History can be unreservedly recommended as the best in the field.

Yale University. *George Dahl*

THE ISRAEL SAGA. *By Brooke Peters Church.* With Foreword by Charles C. Torrey. New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. xxvi + 311.

In view of the comparative neglect of the subject, we greet with special enthusiasm this excellent study of the literary genius of the Hebrew narrators and short story writers. Trained by her father, the late Dr. J. P. Peters, Mrs. Church shows rare literary appreciation and poetic insight. Would that many might read her interpretations of such passages as the Creation Story and the Deborah Song! It might well help cure the world of the "short-sightedness that is deliberately allowing the cultural heritage of posterity to lose an entire literature."

Yale University. *George Dahl*

THE FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL TRADITION *by Vincent Taylor, Ph. D., D. D. (Lond.).* Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London, 1933. Pp. viii 214 8vo.

The author of this work is well known in America through his book "Behind the Third Gospel" (1926), and his: "The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel" (1927). In the work before us he has rendered English-speaking readers a great service by presenting an intelligible account of the works of the German protagonists of form-criticism (M. Dibelius, M. Albertz, K. L. Schmidt, E. Fascher, R. Bultmann, P. Fiebig, L. Koehler, and others), together with a discriminating, yet not altogether unsympathetic critique of the methods and results of these scholars. He then proceeds to apply some simple principles, which seem to him valid, to the understanding of the method of transmission and collection of the Gospel stories. Taylor's idea is that certain sayings of Jesus were remembered and passed on by oral tradition, and that just enough of a story was told in connection with each one to give the saying a setting and to make the point of the saying effective. He thinks the tradition did not accurately preserve the chronology or the locality of these stories. Narratives

which culminate in such sayings he calls "Pronouncement Stories." When compilers of pre-canonical documents and of Gospels made their collections of sayings and stories, they placed these stories in their general framework as best they could.

Other sayings were grouped by some mnemonic method without accounts of circumstances which led to their utterance. Taylor agrees with Easton that some of these collections, such as Luke 6:27-38, may have been made in the life time of Jesus and under his direction. His chapters on the process by which the parables and miracle-stories were transmitted and compiled contain an excellent critique of Bultmann's excessive estimate of the creative power of the primitive community, and his chapter on "The Emergence of the Gospels" is full of challenging hints, even if one does not go the whole way with the author. Taylor has produced a book which no student of the New Testament should ignore.

University of Pennsylvania.

*George A. Barton*

THE GROWTH OF THE GOSPELS. *F. C. Grant,* Abingdon Press, 1933.

"The Growth of the Gospels" is an excellent book, marked by competent scholarship. Dean Grant shows a thorough mastery of the work already done in gospel origins and advances the line of study by his own investigations and insights. That the New Testament is a product of the church is an old position newly stressed by the author's interpretation of "Formgeschichte." "Why we have Gospels" is answered very completely though some reasons (e. g. liturgical) are not explained enough to be convincing. The multiple source theory of gospel origins is an interesting hypothesis though it may be challenged. The book is especially valuable for its presentation of Q and L for the analysis, sources and characteristics of Mark and Luke. The later and less important position assigned to Matthew may be questioned. It is an advantage to have the Fourth Gospel material together with the Synoptics. A disproportionate space is given to the Logos discussion. John is "Hellenistic religious mystery-drama brought down to earth and forced to make terms with a tradition" such as Mark.

This book presents independence of judgment, good estimates of other scholars' opinions and a sound, skilful exploration in the

obscure and difficult area of early gospel growth. The format is to be commended. Syracuse University *Dwight M. Beck*

**RELIGION AND THE GOOD LIFE.** By *William Clayton Bower*. New York, Abingdon Press, 1933, \$2.

One of the latest volumes in the Abingdon Religious Education monographs is the book by William Clayton Bower called "Religion and the Good Life." Doctor Bower is an accredited leader in the field of religious education and anything that he writes commands attention. Heretofore, for the most part, this writer has been publishing books and articles in the field of curriculum, teaching techniques, and the philosophy of religious education. In his latest volume, Doctor Bower seriously sets for himself the task of discovering the place that religion has in the making of character. One would have a right to expect from the title of the book that the author would define both religion and the "good life." This Doctor Bower does. You will be interested in his distinction between character and personality. Conscience is described as the product of social experience rather than the traditional monitor that once was relied upon to tell us unerringly what is right or wrong. Once having defined religion and character, Doctor Bower goes on to show how the spiritual reconstruction of experience may be achieved and how the successful integration of personality may become a reality. This is a thoughtful and timely book. The style is chaste and the language is non-technical.

Brothers College *Frank Glenn Lankard*

**THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST.** By *F. Gresham Machen*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1932, \$2.50.

Some little while ago the comprehensive volume by Professor F. Gresham Machen called "The Virgin Birth of Christ" came to my book shelf in the form of the revised edition which is but one-half the price of the former volume. No reader can make even a cursory review of this book without coming to have great respect for the careful, painstaking work and the biblical scholarship of Professor Machen.

This book is profoundly more than a superficial essay on the virgin birth of Jesus. It is in fact an exposition of biblical criticism including large areas of the New Testament. Doctor Machen believes in the credibility of

the virgin birth. He examines, in addition to the New Testament narratives, the thought of the virgin birth in the second century of our era. He compares the birth narratives of the Gospels with those found in secular history. In addition, Doctor Machen examines and criticizes the theories of Jewish and Pagan derivation. He concludes that even if the story of the virgin birth stood alone, even then we should be slow to brush it aside on historical grounds as untrue. Taken in connection with all that we know of Jesus, the author feels that the evidence is supplemented to the degree that it is quite sufficient to be convincing.

The book is an exhaustive work. You may not agree with the author's position historically, or be convinced of the necessity of the virgin birth religiously, but the ramifications of the subject are so manifold that a judicious and careful reading of the volume constitutes almost a course of study in the Greek, Jewish, and Roman world of the New Testament. The erudition and information so markedly present in the book are enough to commend its reading.

Brothers College *Frank Glenn Lankard*

**For Second Hand  
THEOLOGICAL BOOKS**  
Largest stock in America. Over half a million *Theological Books*—classified by Subjects. Catalogs Free. Correspondence and "Want List" invited.  
**Schulte's Book Store** 80 and 82 Fourth Ave.  
New York City

Outline for a  
**COURSE OF STUDY**  
For Secondary Schools Offering a  
**UNIT OF BIBLE**  
for

**College Entrance and Bibliography**

Prepared by a Committee of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, 1932.

Price, 25 cents each postpaid  
Ten copies or more at 20 cents each postpaid.

Address, **CARL E. PURINTON**, Sec'y-Treas.,  
13 Avon Place, Hempstead, N. Y.

or

**The Council of Church Boards of Education,**  
Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

THE REBEL PROPHET: Studies in the Personality of Jeremiah. *By T. Crouther Gordon.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932. Pp. 260. \$2.00.

The two opening chapters of this stimulating set of eight lectures deal respectively with the Psychology of Prophecy and the Man Behind the Book. Thereupon follow successive chapters in which Jeremiah assumes the rôles of statesman, rebel, optimist, poet and mystic. Finally there is an unusually comprehensive and satisfying study of the resemblance and contrast between Jeremiah and Jesus.

Several striking features of the book call for mention: (1) All quotations from the prophet appear in a new translation which usually succeeds very well in conveying the rhythm and feeling of the original; (2) So great is the wealth of illustrative material, garnered from the varied fields of statecraft, church, general literature, etc., as to prove occasionally almost an embarrassment of riches; (3) The author presents numerous independent and original points of view, as for example in his characterizations of Jeremiah as optimist and mystic. Even where one cannot quite follow the argument to its conclusion, the net result is to provoke the reader to new insights—which is all to the good. Not yet has the final and definitive word been said regarding the many unsolved problems connected with the book of Jeremiah. All the more cordial welcome, therefore, do we accord such a fresh, vigorous and suggestive approach to the prophet as the one before us. Teachers of the Bible everywhere will find this volume a source of inspiration and help.

Yale University      *George Dahl*

STUDIES IN THE MINISTRY OF OUR LORD. First Series. *H. F. B. Mackay.* Morehouse Publishing Co. Pp. 270. \$2.

Another "Life of Jesus," but a different one. It is a biography of Jesus based on the four Gospels just as they are, without critical questionings. In this respect it is like Papini's except that the author is fully aware of Gospel criticism, but prefers to ignore it and to take the view of Jesus as the first century church took it.

The first series ends with the Transfiguration. The object to the "Studies" is inspirational. The tone is that of a churchman of Bishop Gore's type: "Our Lord's baptism was what his profession is to a Religious and his ordination to a priest." After the baptism

Jesus went into "retreat," a natural thing for a deeply spiritual man and mystic of that age and clime to do. In his exposition of the temptation of Jesus the author reveals profound psychological insight. An outstanding contribution of the volume is the use made of evidently first-hand knowledge of Palestinian geography and oriental customs, accompanied by vivid description. The book will prove exceedingly useful to counter-balance a mere critical study of the life of Jesus.

Syracuse University      *Ismar J. Peritz*

PALESTINE, LAND OF THE LIGHT. *Frederick DeLand Leete.* Houghton Mifflin Company. 279 pages 8 vo. \$2.50.

Bishop Leete of the Methodist Episcopal Church took a leisurely trip through the Holy Land. He knew what he was looking for—the scene of sacred history—and found it. He saw not mere people, archaeological sites, streams, valleys, hills and mountains, but he saw all these in the light of biblical religion. Consequently he does not only charmingly describe but he interprets. It is not a technical textbook on Palestinian geography, but when read alongside with one of these, it will be found informing, particularly on present conditions, but more than that, it is likely to make you fall in love with the little country whence so much good came.

Syracuse University      *Ismar J. Peritz*

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

DAILY BIBLE STUDIES. *Floyd W. Tompkins.* Morehouse Publishing Company. 235 pages 8vo. \$1.50.

CHURCH SCHOOLS OF TODAY. *Hugh Hartshorne and E. V. Ehrhart.* Yale University Press. Pp. 260. \$2.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE. *T. A. Lacey. Samuel R. Leland.* 270 pages 8vo. \$1.75.

ST. PAUL'S MISSIONARY METHODS. *Roland Allen. Samuel R. Leland.* 244 pages 8vo. \$1.50.

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE. *An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.* *Robert L. Ottley. Samuel R. Leland.* 240 pages 8vo. \$1.50.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY. Revised edition. *C. L. Drawbridge.* With a Survey of the Leaders and Literature in the Conflict Between Christianity and Its Opponents by *Edwin Lewis. Samuel R. Leland.* 312 pages 8vo. \$2.50.